

RELIGION IN LIFE

A CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY

Vol. V

Summer Number, 1936

No. 3

EDITORIAL BOARD

JOHN BAILLIE

WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN

LUCIUS H. BUGBEE

CHARLES K. GILBERT

LYNN HAROLD HOUGH

JAMES R. JOY

HENRY P. VAN DUSEN

JOHN W. LANGDALE

HOWARD C. ROBBINS

FREDERICK K. STAMM

ADVISORY COUNCIL

Harvie Branscomb

Edgar Sheffield Brightman

Clarence Tucker Craig

Albert Edward Day

Wilbert F. Howard

Carl Sumner Knopf

Edward H. Kraus

Umphrey Lee

Edwin Lewis

McIlyar H. Lichliter

Halford E. Luccock

Harris Franklin Rall

Richard Roberts

Wilbour E. Saunders

Luther A. Weigle

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Rudyard Kipling.....	S. Parkes Cadman 323
A Half-Century of Liberal Theology.....	Henry P. Van Dusen 336
The Organic Principle of the Church.....	Russell Henry Stafford 354
Blessed Are the Debonair.....	Earl Marlatt 369
The Revolt of Israel's Prophets Against Nationalism in Religion.....	Leroy Waterman 380
Unfinished Business.....	Charles E. Schofield 388
Modern Theological Education.....	F. J. Foakes Jackson 398
Civilization Is for Man.....	Melvin C. Hunt 407
The Man Who Saw the Grace of God—A Study of Barnabas.....	Wilfrid L. Hannam 417
In a Time Like This.....	Carl S. Patton 425
Manchurian Miniatures.....	Fred D. Gealy 431
What Should I Read?.....	R. Birch Hoyle 445
A German View of Church and State.....	Clarence Tucker Craig 455
Book Reviews.....	459
Bookish Brevities.....	479

Editorial correspondence should be addressed to John W. Langdale, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Business communications regarding subscriptions, etc., should be addressed to The Abingdon Press, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Entered as second-class matter January 16, 1932, at the post-office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. This number is the July, 1936, issue.

Subscription price, \$2.00 per year; postage free U. S. Possessions and Mexico; to Canada, 18 cents additional; other foreign postage, 30 cents; single copies, 75 cents.

Published by
THE ABINGDON PRESS
NEW YORK

CINCINNATI

CHICAGO

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS
LIBRARY

Who's Who?

S. PARKES CADMAN, D.D., LL.D. Minister of Central Congregational Church, Brooklyn, N. Y.

CLARENCE TUCKER CRAIG, D.D., Ph.D. Professor of New Testament Language and Literature, Oberlin Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin, Ohio.

FRED D. GEALY, Ph.D. Professor of New Testament Language and Literature, Aoyama Gakuin School of Theology, Tokyo, Japan.

WILFRID L. HANNAM, President of the London Methodist Council and of the London Federation of Free Churches, London, England.

R. BIRCH HOYLE, A.T.S. Guest Professor in the Chair of Systematic Theology at Western Theological Seminary, Pittsburgh, Pa.

MELVIN C. HUNT, D.D. Minister of Central Methodist Episcopal Church, Mansfield, Ohio.

F. J. FOAKES JACKSON, D.D., Litt.D., D.Theol. (Strasbourg). Senior Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge, Fellow of American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Briggs' Graduate Professor of Christian Institutions at Union Theological Seminary, New York, 1916-1934. Englewood, N. J.

EARL MARLATT, Ph.D. Professor of Philosophy of Literature at Boston University School of Theology, Boston, Mass.

CARL S. PATTON, D.D., Ph.D. Professor of Practical Theology, Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, Cal.

CHARLES E. SCHOFIELD, D.D., President of Iliff School of Theology, Denver, Colo.

RUSSELL HENRY STAFFORD, D.D., LL.D. Minister of the Old South Church in Boston, Mass.

HENRY P. VAN DUSEN, Ph.D. Dean of Students and Assistant Professor of Systematic Theology and Philosophy of Religion at Union Theological Seminary, New York.

LEROY WATERMAN, Ph.D., Litt.D. Professor of Semitics, Chairman of the Department of Oriental Languages, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Copyright, 1936, by The Abingdon Press, Inc. All rights reserved—no part of this magazine may be produced in any form without permission in writing from the publisher, except by a reviewer who wishes to quote brief passages in connection with a review written for inclusion in magazine or newspaper.

Printed in the United States of America

Rudyard Kipling

S. PARKES CADMAN

I

NO modern writer has been so constantly discussed, blessed, or banned as Kipling. His work had the challenge which creates pronounced partisanship: passionate enthusiasm and fierce antagonism combined to forbid chilling neutrality concerning him. His star arose so suddenly to reflect with startling vividness the light of the Far East upon the fatuously complacent West that it reminded scholars of young Macaulay's emergence in *The Edinburgh Review* during 1825. His essay on Milton in that august organ of the Reform Movement established at once his great literary reputation. The sudden blaze of popularity it kindled, however, was outshone by Kipling's leap from pupilage to literary eminence when he was several years younger than Macaulay. It is impossible to transmit to our jaded time an adequate conception of the eager expectancy the former celebrity aroused during the eighties and nineties of the past century. When at the summit of his too monarchical influence the elder of his two daughters died, and he lay dangerously ill in New York City, it is scarcely an exaggeration to say that the world kept its vigil at his door. All classes and all countries interested in one whom they regarded as the author of his age felt a keen sense of impending loss. And though his reign ended long before he died, the widespread comments evoked by his death were an indirect testimony that at his best Kipling is a classic, and also a very quotable one for sacred and secular purposes. On December 29, 1935, a preoccupied and largely alienated public heard that he was seventy years old: twenty days later he was dead. Then the verdict was rendered that one of the most amazing careers in literature had come to an end and that a very forceful personality had been taken out of life.

Had not "The Five Towns" of the Staffordshire "Potteries" been noted for their beautiful chinaware, this prodigy of letters when he was eighteen might have had no chance to exist. It was the excellence of that porcelain which drew a modest but clever painter and designer named John Lockwood Kipling to Burslem, one of the "Towns" in question, in order to

develop his art. Arnold Bennett, who was born at another of them, Hanley, in 1867, laid the scenes of his best novel in Burslem. John Lockwood Kipling was fortunate enough to win for his wife Alice Macdonald, the witty and lovely daughter of the Rev. George B. Macdonald, a Methodist clergyman who became a trusted leader of his Church. The future Mrs. Kipling was also the sister of three distinguished ladies of Victorian England, namely, Lady Burne Jones, Lady Poynter, and Mrs. Baldwin, mother of Mr. Stanley Baldwin, the present Premier of Great Britain. Their only brother, the Rev. Frederick W. Macdonald, M.A., whose felicitous utterance was his conspicuous gift, examined me in 1886 for my entrance as a theological student at Richmond College. I recall with thankfulness his generous consideration for a crude lad facing a critical moment.

No Methodist manse known to me has sheltered a more remarkable family than that of the Macdonalds at Burslem. John Lockwood Kipling first met Alice, the brightest of the group, at Rudyard Lake, situated in a remote corner of Izaak Walton's native county of Staffordshire, where it borders on that of Cheshire. They fell in love there and then, and after their marriage went to India, where their son was born on December 30, 1865. The wedded happiness which this event consummated reminded them of the homeland lake of their fond recollection. So they named him Rudyard in honor of their first meeting place. From Bombay, where his father had taught in the School of Art, the Kiplings moved to Lahore, in which city the father officiated as Curator of the Government Museum, and there and at Bombay Rudyard's childhood was spent.

For climatic as well as educational reasons he was sent to England at the age of six, and the experiences of his school days, which lasted until he was sixteen, are revealed in *Stalky and Co.*, one of the truest books of its kind extant. He was still in his teens when he returned to India to enter journalism as his chosen profession, bringing with him the estimate of his English teachers that he was a precocious and brilliant youth who could do anything he purposed doing, but who was somewhat indifferent to his technical studies.

He secured a position on the staff of *The Civil and Military Gazette* of Lahore, and those who remember the opening passages of *The Man Who Would Be King* should have no difficulty in detecting the author's first reactions to Anglo-Indian journalism. Pre-eminently fitted for its reportorial side, as a special writer this youth of seventeen had no superior in

India. His absorbent mind, "wax to receive, and marble to retain," was incessantly stimulated by the endless novelty and fascination of the huge peninsula's gorgeous landscapes and diversified human groups. His close observation, retention of what he saw, and the exactitude of its transmission were monopolized but not dismayed by the medley of races, religions, castes, creeds, customs, and costumes that we loosely call India. This vast, crowded, mysterious, and incomprehensible Dominion of the British Crown was as surely rediscovered by the young journalist's pen as originally it had been conquered by the sword of Clive. Nor did the white residents there escape his inclusive eye. The morals, manners, and outstanding traits of Anglo-Indians, civil dignitaries, merchants, soldiers, tourists, and hangers-on were so strikingly portrayed that their studied condescension was disturbed if not corrected. Perhaps no Occidental can understand India's polyglot multitudes, but young Kipling, then an obscure journalist, at least made their foreign governors more aware of them and of the problems they portended. The legislative codes, judicial procedure, and to a less extent the literary traditions of Great Britain had been imposed upon the native population by methods which Kipling felt free to criticize, yet not the less admired as a model of constructive statesmanship.

In respect to his forthright judgments on men and things, it should be considered that this young Daniel who essayed the hazardous rôle of mediator between two profoundly separated cultures was born in India of Puritan stock refined by Methodist forbears on both sides of his house. His mental habits had been shaped by an English school of good standing, and his morals drilled in its traditions of personal integrity and truthfulness. While in his formative stage he was transplanted into an exotic society markedly conscious of its superiority and convinced that India's welfare depended upon her submissiveness to Britain's oversight and protection. From such mingled sources he derived the "Colonial" tendencies which cling to much that he thought and wrote. They also enabled him to reveal India to her rulers, and Britons to themselves, as no other writer of English birth had hitherto done. He held the clear mirror of his dramatic imagination before East and West with fidelity to both; yet is there not a hint of their failure to respond in his confession that "never the twain shall meet"? Moreover, his strained emphasis of "the glories of our blood and state" now sound stale and profitless. Intelligent readers view such rhetoric as an outburst of emotional ideology mocked by the chaos of the world they con-

front. Yet Kipling was not an imperialist of Mussolini's brand, nor did he hesitate to repudiate the Italian dictator as a malignant tyrant. He had his national aberrations—as the majority of human beings must—and he scorned the freakish notions of cranks, pedants, and fanatics who, he believed, obstructed the march of progress and violated rational ideas of right and justice. Nevertheless, he knew that the soberest kind of history implies some sort of Utopia, and his swift discernment of the romantic in the realistic is one lasting quality of his authorship.

The terseness of his best descriptions suited the strong silent men who were his favorite subjects because they did their duty as they conceived it, scornful of consequence. And if he heralded what Britain had achieved in such lusty tones that he made his own and other advanced nations more fully realize her importance, he was also quick to ask his countrymen "what they should know of England who only England know." Ever and anon similar examples of moderation added to the effectiveness of his advocacy by registering the reserve which is its valuable factor.

II

In 1886, when he was twenty-one, he made a curious experiment as printer and publisher by taking from the files of *The Civil and Military Naval Gazette* at Lahore the special articles he had written for that paper and "building a sort of book with the office plant; a lean, oblong docket, wire stitched, to imitate a Government document, printed on brown paper and secured with red tape." This unpretentious issue of *Departmental Ditties* was afterward reprinted at London and circulated in a sumptuous binding. But Kipling declared he "loved it best when it was a little brown baby with a pink string around its stomach—a child's child."

The merits of this "child's child" were variously appraised. Staid, conservative Britons snorted contemptuously at the slangy, shirt-sleeved versifier who rushed in where angels feared to tread, but Kipling refused to be so summarily dismissed. That he had come to stay was confirmed in 1887 when *Plain Tales From the Hills* appeared: and his stay was vindicated in the interval between 1887 and 1894 during which the following works were published: *Soldiers Three*; *In Black and White*; *The Story of the Gadsbys*; *Under the Deodars*; *The Phantom Rickshaw*; *Wee Willie Winkle*; *Life's Handicap*; *The Light That Failed*; *Barrack Room Ballads*; *Many Inventions*; and last but not least, *The Jungle Books*. Mrs. Hauks-

bee and Mrs. Mallowe, of Simla; those "three musketeers"—Ortheris, Learoyd, and the immortal Mulvaney; Jakin and Lew, the two drummer boys who beat their last call together; and less prominent yet interesting figures of British and Hindu army officers, collectors, princes, fakirs, saints, high-browed Brahmins or low-caste vagrants, crowd the pages of his earlier books; all more or less tragical, amusing, or amazing in turn. They move in a magical atmosphere, which makes every word or action seem to the manner born. Unafraid and brooking no interference, he wrote as he felt, without let or hindrance, impressing his readers with his perfect familiarity concerning a complex manner of life previously unfamiliar to them.

Late in 1889 Kipling came to settle in England, and on March 25, 1890, the London *Times* published an article about the man and his work which placed him on his throne. He never received official honors, not because, as rumor whispers, he offended Queen Victoria by his poem "The Widow of Windsor," but because of a more roystering ballad which has never been published. Neither knighthood nor the laureateship, however, could have lifted him to the eminence he attained as the recognized poet and prose writer of the average patriotic Briton and also of the ruling groups of the empire. In London he formed a friendship with Wolcott Balestier, a young American author to whom he dedicated *Barrack Room Ballads*. They collaborated in writing a decidedly second-rate story entitled *The Naulahka*, and their intimacy led to Kipling's introduction to his friend's sister, Miss Caroline Starr Balestier, whom he married in 1892. Her family owned property in Brattleboro, Vermont, and in the late summer of the same year the newly wedded couple built their home there, and called it *The Naulahka*. A visit he had previously paid to South Africa meant much to his future work, and he never did it to better effect than during the years he spent in the United States. His merits had been applauded by the initiated in India; they were now enthusiastically welcomed on both sides the Atlantic. He became the literary idol of hosts of British and American devotees and the European continent presently surrendered to his spell. One of the greatest figures in French literature recently acclaimed Kipling as superior to Dickens and Thackeray of the Victorian age, and to his contemporaries Shaw and Wells. For this authority, who evidently leans to Fascism, *Soldiers Three* and *They* are permanent glories of English literature and very near its apex at that.

It is within the mark to say that 1893 was Kipling's *annus mirabilis*; and that he then reached his highest point in literature by the publication of a book of stories called *Many Inventions*. In fact "the years spent in Brattleboro were great years for Kipling, the storyteller and the poet. Here we first meet Mowgli; here we are told about the Cockney clerk who could remember being a Greek galley slave and a Viking."¹ The two *Jungle Books* came out as a crowning achievement in 1894 and 1895, and in 1896, the year the Kiplings finally returned to England to live, *The Seven Seas* appeared to silence censors who decreed he had nothing of the poet in him.

Although many Americans acclaimed Kipling as *the* author *par excellence* of his age, and more still were gratified by his presence among them, he was never at home here. He seemed incapable of an adequate response to their generous hospitality or of justly appraising the social structure and political management of their republic. The same incapacity beset him when he discussed any country except India. It is one of the curiosities of genius that a writer so superbly equipped and well informed as Kipling should have become dogmatic, cocksure, and censorious when his provincial bias was offended. This peculiar weakness was not confined to countries closely related to his own by kindred ideals and institutions and a common language. Like Tennyson, who could think of nothing more in the French Revolution than "the red fool fury of the Seine," Kipling excoriated foreign peoples whose habits and customs did not suit his preconceptions. His belittling tendencies in respect to America cropped out in his earliest book of travels, entitled *From Sea to Sea*. Its carefully elaborated descriptions of mere externals were not a sufficient substitute for his neglect of the creative elements of American life and its various manifestations.

His indifference to the herculean labors necessitated by the occupation and settlement of a great continent and his readiness to expatiate at length on the sins and shortcomings of its cosmopolitan cities were not worthy of Kipling. He had brought home to countless eager readers the colors and savors of far-distant places. Nothing escaped his observation when he chose to give it free play. He rendered an immense service to the world by reminding its divided races of their congenital oneness as human beings and of the diviner destiny that oneness would ultimately effect. But he openly

¹The *London Times*, January 18, 1936.

disliked the fulfillment of Bishop Berkeley's oft-quoted prophecy that "Westward the course of empire takes its way."

His Anglo-Indian prejudices viewed this as the decidedly wrong direction. It should have been toward the farther East where the brightest jewel of the British Crown might reward the seekers. The eminent author, Sir Edmund Gosse, first penetrated this joint in Kipling's armor and in so doing anticipated other trustworthy critics who deplored his tenacious clinging to causes that were dead. One authority states that Kipling was chronically irritated by America, and if this is credible, of course his animadversions lose force. Certainly, his irritation blinded him to the excellencies by which not only our country but every other must survive and do its work in the world. Again, as an Anglo-Indian, accustomed to the subservience of native and conquered races, he must have chafed against the brusque behavior of the sturdy, independent, but on the whole well-disposed citizens of this republic. The tremendous pull of what was for him the baleful star of the West caused many millions to take the same course, and millions more to wish they could follow it. Immigration was seldom if ever higher than during and after Kipling's sojourn in Vermont. Yet how could a federation of commonwealths which had dispensed with a governing class prosper and increase so palpably? These sentiments found vent in his fiery protest when President Taft proposed a reciprocal tariff between Canada and the United States. He could not endure the displacement of elect minorities by a rude and tumultuous majority of the masses. The authority he exalted with a fervor reminiscent of Nietzsche was everywhere jeopardized by the United States as the world's foremost example of popular sovereignty.

Worse still, this sovereignty was largely pretentious, a deceptive gesture rather than a reality, and in no sense representative of the citizen's control. He associated it with insincerity, greed, graft, chicanery, corruption, and vulgarity. This he openly argued, and addressed his plea to a public which quietly ignored it at home and abroad. As for Americans, they admired him so warmly as an author that they forgave his maledictions as an amateur politician. They had forgiven Dickens much for the same reason, and he afterward apologized for his ill-natured comments; they forgave Kipling more, but he did not apologize. Such emotional misreadings of national character had cost Great Britain so dearly in 1776 that one some-

times wonders why Kipling did not avoid hasty and superficial opinions nurtured by willful prejudice.

III

It is more congenial to relate that while he resided in the United States the inequalities of his earlier product vanished. Its jerkiness and mannerisms were supplanted by a fertility of invention, raciness of dialogue, and exuberant vitality which came to their own in *The Jungle Books*. By means of these inspired "beast stories" he entranced even casual readers, and extended his sway over a new literary realm and a new audience. Competent judges regard them as Kipling's most flawless achievement. Their verisimilitude is so perfect as to make us believe that if the wild creatures of the forest could speak, the speech the author allots to each of them is exactly what they would use. Its texture and imagisms harmonize with their known habits so completely that we are apt to forget his amazing exploitation of the ape, the cobra, the tiger, the panther, the bear, and the elephant is a unique triumph of purest imagination which has no competitor. Of the books belonging to this kind of literature *Kim* is the most successful. As fiction it is formless, but its entrancing pictures of Indian life are so realistic that they stimulate in us an almost physical awareness of what is depicted.

The novelist who exchanges speculation for certitude treads the pioneering path which the artist and the scientist mark out for themselves. Kipling's peculiar adaptability for doing this; for unveiling the soul in concrete things, gave him the passport to numerous remoter regions. An illustration of his entrance there is found in his story *The Night Mail*, written many years ago. It depicts with details a voyage over the ocean in an airship propelled by a mysterious ray. Here his imagination was prophetic of an oncoming world controlled by an Air Board which would transform human intercourse. He follows his accustomed order by first laying out the groundwork of the tale in what had been actually accomplished, and then erecting upon it a novel structure with architectonic skill. Should every writer of fiction be judged by this test, how many could meet it? Consider in this connection the ballads he wrote after reading the great ballads of English literature. One of his, "M'Andrews Hymn," stands out from the rest for its meteoric drive and its virile, unconventional artistry;

but chiefly because it showed what he could do with technical language. A single stanza must suffice as a sample of its qualities:

"To match wi' Scotia's noblest speech yon orchestra sublime
Whaurto—uplifted like the Just—the tail-rods mark the time,
The crank-throws give the double-bass, the feed-pump sobs an' heaves,
An' now the main eccentrics start their quarrel on the sheaves:
Her time, her own appointed time, the rocking link-head bides,
Till—hear that note?—the rod's return whings glimmerin' through the guides."

Other modern poets have wrestled with the machine age, but their endeavors to idealize it are puerile when compared with Kipling's mastery of the situation. The faultless precision of piston rods, wheels, and eccentrics transfers the reader's mental vision to the engine room of an ocean liner. He watches with the eyes of his mind the massive machinery at its semimiraculous task; he is aware that the professional accuracy of what he reads is unimpeachable. Such prose and poetry as Kipling alone could write ennobled the men of whom Lindbergh and M'Andrew are representative. They were assured that the apparently insensible ways and means they operated were agencies of a better civilization: that their control of them was a moral discipline, and that the humblest fireman or oiler of their ranks could hold up his head among kings.

After the South African War which blasted his hopes and intensified his fears, Kipling found comfort and peace for his wounded spirit in the quiet of rural England. The dominance he craved for imperial leaders was abolished by the mandate of the British people, who elected as their successors Ministers of the State regarded by him as at best a very pleasant, gentlemanly set of ostriches. He was yet to be convinced they would not ruin the projects for which he assiduously contended. But whatever happened, the pastoral tranquillity of Sussex, one of the fairest of the southern shires, was secure, and there he fixed his dwelling place, first at Rottingdean and then at Burwash, to find in nature what he could not find in political crusades which had become rancid for him. Here in truth prehistoric times touched and mingled with the twentieth century: for it was here he wrote *Puck of Pooks Hill* and *Rewards and Fairies*. Their semi-historical mythology was intended to kindle afresh in the children and youth of England's countryside a love of the land rooted in the memories that it suggested. During an ageless past other children and youth had played on its highways and commons, and as men and women had lived and died

for the tilling and defense of its fields. *Puck's Song* reveals the pith of Kipling's purpose:

"See you the dimpled track that runs,
All hollow through the wheat?
O that was where they hauled the guns
That smote King Philip's fleet.

"See you our stilly woods of oak
And the dread ditch beside?
O that was where the Saxons broke,
On the day that Harold died."

Since neither the lovely nor the ugly, the memorable nor the negligible are positive attributes in themselves, but owe what they are for us to what we conceive them to be, this poetical reaction of Kipling to his nation's "rough island's story" is an intellectual splendor which no rational critic will dispute. By stimulating what he called "the instinct of inherited continuity" he gave that story additional significance. Perceptibly, while other and far greater poets interpreted the spiritual realities with a poignancy, power, and ethereal vision he did not possess, his function was to minister to the nearer necessities and demands of human action here and now. Yet on occasion he also entered their domain as they could not enter his with the intimacy and authority he displayed.

IV

As I have said, the South African War inflicted a staggering blow on Kipling's Cromwellian patriotism. He faced it with the pride which goes before a fall, and at its melancholy close he was sadly disillusioned. If as a man of imagination he had moved into quieter, mellower surroundings at Rottingdean, as a man of action he championed his countrymen against the Boer. This dichotomy not only injured his influence, it also banished his peace. Probably it was never again glad confident morning with Rudyard Kipling. He had been the staunch defender of that swashbuckling imperialism which was in part a hangover from Lord Beaconsfield's foreign policy, and was now about to be humiliated by "the embattled farmers" of the Transvaal. For the sake of Britain's sacred calling to establish law and order among the backward tribes of her dominions he had not heeded the complaints of his unprivileged and forlorn fellow citizens of the Homeland. Poverty-stricken and miserable as millions of these were, they should none

the less cultivate the cardinal virtues of alertness, diligence, courage, and determination, animated by the racial arrogance which is so often the vice of the foolish. After his idealized dream of empire had faded on the Veldt the plain folk of the Island Kingdom who had borne the brunt of the ignominious struggle got their innings. Under the sagacious statesmanship of Sir Henry Campbell Bannerman an era of conciliation and social reform set in. This was distressing enough for the poet, who had sung of the glories of the flag, and the unbeatable "thin red lines" of British infantry.

In justice to Kipling, however, it should be said that no one author can possibly survey or express all the political and economic developments even of a single decade. Finality and complete objectivity should not be expected of him. Any literary treatment he offers must be his own selection from the facts in the case; the choice of those facts will depend in large measure upon his character, interests, sympathies, and environment. He is himself a part of what he writes. Besides, every critic knows that the old tag *omnis determinatio est negatio* applies, as the London *Spectator* remarks, to all the works of men's hands, and that books, like statues and pictures, have certain defects which are the counterparts of their merits. From this angle of criticism it is clear that wherein Kipling was right he was right indeed, and wherein he was wrong he was wrong with a vengeance. Time will strike the balance fair.

The remembrance that twenty thousand Britons had died in South Africa for no worthy end must have aroused in him some serious reflections. The Rev. Dr. Henry Betts, in his able article on Kipling, refers to Mr. A. G. Gardiner's description of a scene which occurred at the close of the war. Lady Burne Jones, Kipling's aunt, who stoutly opposed it, hung out a placard at Rottingdean with the prophet Elijah's words to Ahab upon it: "Hast thou killed and *also* taken possession?" When the mob gathered to threaten her there emerged from the house a small dark man in spectacles with words of soothing and peace. It was Kipling, face to face with the passions he had done so much to kindle.² His aunt's intrepid remonstrance was not lost on him, nor had he utterly abandoned the traditions of his Methodist ancestors. Quite otherwise, these assumed a permanent form in his hymn *The Recessional*, written in 1897 as the Diamond Jubilee of Queen Victoria concluded the period named after her. This is the noblest

² The London *Quarterly Review*, April, 1936, pp. 153-63.

lyric of its kind Protestantism has produced: it strikes the organ note which believing souls will never willingly let die.

Had he been better able to discern the quality of his output, Kipling would not have included the best and the worst in the same volume. But he was seemingly oblivious of the contrasts entailed. Still incorrigible as regards international politics, he plunged once more in its turbid stream when he wrote of "The White Man's Burden." The German menace which began with Bismarck's sardonic comment that the British Empire was "a satiated development" inspired the disillusioned poet to summon his nation to defend itself against the siege of battering days that were sure to come. The ghastly sequel was that in 1914 the leading Powers of Christendom sprang at each other with unprecedented destructiveness and fell into the pit they had intended for "The Yellow Peril." Kipling proclaimed his devout allegiance to the Allies in a series of poems, letters, and speeches which require no special emphasis in this article. But it is notable that he lost his only son, Lieutenant John Kipling, of the Irish Guards, and, further, that every night at the Menin Gate on Flanders' front The Last Post is now sounded for that brave lad by the endowment of his father. Much else that was forever lost is commemorated by this melancholy ceremony. Space forbids further allusion to Kipling's invasion of world politics. It had its redeeming features, but Time alone can clear away the clouds of partisanship that his predilection for physical violence has drawn over his reputation. He may have been right in some of his convictions; certainly he was wrong in others, but he will never be found to have been anything but sincere, valiant, single-hearted, and a passionate lover of his country. During his last years he added little of the best quality to his fiction, but in 1930 he wrote *Thy Servant a Dog*, a tribute replete with compassion and amusement from one who was a lifelong lover of the dog.

Academic distinctions were given him by the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge, Edinburgh, McGill, Durham, and Athens, and he was elected a Fellow of Magdalen College, Cambridge. But probably he most esteemed the doctorates of Paris and Strasbourg and his membership in the French Academy of Science and Politics. These honorifics were bestowed chiefly because of his best verse; his contributions to that rather elusive branch of literature known as "Children's Books"; his complete mastery of the short story, and the authentic tone and color he imparted to his

works of imagination. Those who bestowed them also recalled that no writer had excelled him in condensation, nor in his pleadings for a costly conflict which he espoused as absolutely justified.

That some achievements of his literary genius will be quoted as long as our language lasts is more than enough to give Rudyard Kipling a secure place in the history of English letters. Nothing need be added save to say that when our period of tension and confusion has passed, and Time's ameliorations have had their chance, *The King's Ankus*, *The Last Chanty*, *Kim*, and similar productions of his pen will be the pure grain winnowed from the chaff for the delight and profit of their author's future readers.

Meanwhile, in accordance with the national wish, his body rests in Poets' Corner, Westminster Abbey. The meaning of his burial there can be determined by the rarity of its award in recent years. In 1905 it was given to Sir Henry Irving, in 1928 to Thomas Hardy, and these are the only instances in the present century except that of Rudyard Kipling.

A Half-Century of Liberal Theology

HENRY P. VAN DUSEN

I

THEOLOGY in the eighteen-eighties was marked by a mood of nascent vitality and high expectation. In this it reflected the dominant temper of the Church. America had known only one theological movement of consequence—the New England theology. It had boasted only one great mind, that of Jonathan Edwards. With the recession of the "Great Awakening" which had given it birth and of the series of remarkable revivals which nurtured its early vitality, it became absorbed in abstruse issues of scholastic Calvinism. "The time came when the religious life ebbed and the power of the New England theology declined. . . . The preaching had grown abstract, dry, and powerless, and the people had become tired of it. In the reaction, all theology fell into disrepute."¹ As late as 1880 it was still dominant in most theological seminaries, especially of the Congregational communion. Then came its collapse, sudden and devastating. "Fifteen years later, these teachers had been replaced and in no case by a man who could be considered as belonging to the New England school. It had endured more than 150 years; it had become dominant in a great ecclesiastical denomination; it had founded every Congregational seminary; and, as it were, in a night, it perished from off the face of the earth."² Its passing left a wake of indifference. With certain important exceptions, the middle decades of the nineteenth century were characterized by theological sterility.

Then a new ferment became evident. Its sources were various. Their interconnection was not always obvious, although on the whole they represented a single movement of life and thought. Views which were not new but which had been banned as heretical when they first raised their protest against the dominant Calvinism began to seep into circles of respectability. The inherent and inestimable dignity of human nature—the keystone of Channing's thought a half-century earlier—was made current coin with irresistible charm by Horace Bushnell. The benevolent Fatherhood rather

¹ Lewis F. Stearns, *Present Day Theology* (1891), p. 534.

² F. H. Foster, *A History of the New England Theology*, p. 543.

than the austere Sovereignty of God, another of Channing's most insistent emphases, gained increasing recognition. New and more humane interpretations of the Atonement, first developed in Scotland by Erskine and McLeod Campbell, began to displace the hard rigor of the governmental view. Bushnell, who had been greatly charmed by Coleridge, served as an effective channel for many of the regnant ideas of Romanticism also—ideas already persuasively voiced in Unitarian circles by Emerson, Theodore Parker and the New England Transcendentalists who echoed in their own accents the worship of God-in-nature, the lofty estimate of man, the utopian hopes for humanity of Wordsworth, Coleridge, Carlyle, Herder, Schiller, Goethe, Schleiermacher and European Romanticism generally.

Meantime, the advancing pervasion of the two greatest intellectual forces of the century—the scientific movement and the historical movement—worked a steady and progressive corrosion upon the bulwarks of orthodoxy. It was ever more apparent that Christian theology, if it were to hold the allegiance of intelligent men of the day, must come to terms with modern science, not only its methods but its specific findings regarding the universe and man. With the wide reading of the *Origin of Species* (1859) and the popularizations of Spencer and Huxley, evasion was no longer possible. Simultaneously the new interest in history, also in the dual aspects of method on the one hand and specific conclusions on the other, began to advance directly into the domain of Christian truth through its researches into Christian origins, especially the formation and authenticity of the Scriptures. How far these developments spelled doom for the old theology, how far the latter fell through internal atrophy, is uncertain. In any event, at the sudden collapse of the New England theology, the flood gates opened wide to the new influences. With the exception of those conservative groups who doggedly reaffirmed the old formulae, Christian thinkers were launched headlong upon a floodtide of unfamiliar currents.

II

It is an entirely false impression that theology found itself overwhelmed amidst the swirling intellectual currents of the time. To be sure, the first impacts, both of the theory of evolution and of the "Higher Criticism," were disconcerting; the decades of the sixties and seventies were marked by obvious stress and suffering of mind and heart among thinking Christians. But by the opening of the period of our special interest, the

sense of apprehension had relaxed somewhat; the first tremors of insecurity had begun to pass; men were leaping forward eagerly to explore and occupy the new horizons revealed to view.

To those seeking escape from the perplexities of the new situation, two courses offered themselves. One might take a position resolutely within the historic Christian faith and the traditional Christian experience and, from that stance, attempt adjustment to this new and bewildering modern world. Or one might surrender the familiar standing-ground, launch forth fearlessly upon the new currents, make oneself at home within them, and discovering a new position there, recover as much as possible of the old faith.

To those who chose the latter course, three alternative paths opened.

1. Some, impelled to wrestle with science until they should find it an Angel of the Lord and win from it the desired blessing, pressed the scientific viewpoint beyond its first negations to conclusions which appeared greatly to enrich and strengthen the basic certainty of faith—the reality of God. For this development, John Fiske was an early prophet, Henry Drummond and Lyman Abbott its most influential popularizers. The resulting position we may dub, for lack of a better name, "*scientific liberalism*."
2. Others, turning aside from both traditional theology and science, sought support for religious faith in philosophy. Not a few found the object of their quest through a rediscovery of Plato. This was a path particularly congenial to many English churchmen; they revived *Christian Platonism*.
3. But the more usual recourse was to that brilliant and fascinating adventure of the mind, charted by Hegel, which promised to re-establish all that was essential in Christianity upon an impregnable philosophical base and which was just then claiming the ardent allegiance of the ablest young minds in the British universities—R. B. Haldane (later Lord Haldane), J. S. Haldane, Andrew Seth (later A. Seth Pringle-Pattison), James Seth, W. R. Sorley, A. J. Balfour (later the Earl of Balfour) in Scotland; T. H. Green, Edward and John Caird, F. H. Bradley, Bernard Bosanquet in England. The translation of Hegelian idealism into Christian theology gave "*speculative liberalism*."

However, the larger number within the Church followed the other main course. To them the historical researches of biblical scholars promised not death but new birth for the old faith. From these studies was slowly emerging with fresh clarity and commanding stature the figure of the historic Jesus; here was the alone-adequate focus for Christian theology. And

another great German thinker, Albrecht Ritschl, was fastening attention upon the uniqueness of the Christian experience of reconciliation and redemption; here was the essential and all-sufficient material for theology. Thus were furnished the two watch-words for the new movement—"Back to Christ" and "a theology of Christian experience." This was *evangelical liberalism*.

Thus there emerged four related but distinguishable types of "liberal theology." They remain the four main lines of approach of the liberal mind to Christian faith. Our concern in this paper is mainly with the last, *evangelical liberalism*. But, whichever avenue one followed, the mood was one of confidence and eager expectancy.

III

We are fortunate in having an account of the outlook and interests of the liberal theologians of that time from one of the ablest of their number. In 1891, Dr. Lewis F. Stearns of Bangor, who had just declined a call to the chair of Systematic Theology at Union Seminary, New York, was asked to interpret the American situation before the International Congregational Council in London. He said in part:³

"The substance of our theology is to be found now, as always, in the great unchanging facts and truths of Christianity accepted in every age of the Church. . . . So, if we speak of a 'new theology,' we mean that it is new only as a living body is new at each fresh stage in its growth, conserving and fulfilling the one type that runs through all its changes, and that is neither old nor new. . . .

"Let us look now more closely at some of our present tendencies. We mark, first, a movement toward a more spiritual conception of Christianity. . . . We have been too prone to regard Christianity as a system of abstract truths and of remote historical facts. Notions and propositions have been more to us than the great spiritual realities for which they stand, the sacred events of nineteen hundred years ago more than the redemptive facts of today. . . . We are coming to understand that it is the recognition of the invincible reality of spiritual Christianity which is going to give our theology its great power in the future. . . . Criticism may assail the historical facts of revelation; rationalism may urge objections to its doctrines; but the surf on our coast of Maine might as easily overthrow the granite cliffs against which it breaks as criticism and rationalism disturb the Christian realities which stand firm in the experience of the individual believer and the Church. . . .

"Another sign of the times is the renewed study of the Bible. . . . We bate no jot of loyalty to the Bible. It is to us, no less than to our fathers, the inspired

³ Lewis F. Stearns, "The Present Direction of Theological Thought in the Congregational Churches of the United States," in *Present Day Theology*, pp. 533ff.

record of revelation, the all-sufficient rule of faith and practice, the great means of grace by which we are brought into contact with the spiritual realities of God's kingdom, and by which the Church of Christ is maintained and edified. We do not, however, regard the Bible precisely as our ancestors did. We distinguish the revelation from its record. . . . We are trying to deal fairly and fully with the facts brought to light by modern biblical criticism. . . .

"A more serious problem confronts us in the facts and theories of the Higher Criticism. But here also we are trying to deal honestly with the facts. . . . And while we wait for the result we rest more strongly than ever upon the proof of the divinity and truth of the Bible furnished by the experience of its redemptive power, the old *testimonium Spiritus Sancti internum*, which is ours by virtue of our Protestant descent.

"Again, we are coming more distinctly to recognize the central place of the living Christ in our theological thought. . . . We are less disposed than of old to speculate upon these high subjects, more willing to admit the mystery. It is the Christ Himself, in all His living, saving power, upon whom our thought is concentrated, whom we strive to hold up to men, and in whom we find the key to all the problems of religious thought.

"The way is thus being opened for a larger and richer conception of God. We are trying to 'Christologize' our doctrine of God, to set Him forth as He is seen in the face of Jesus Christ. It is often said that we are coming to a more ethical conception of God. It is more ethical because it is more Christian, because it is not of the God of Nature, but of the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

"So we are learning to Christologize the doctrines of the eternal plan, of creation, and of providence. . . . We have come to Christ, and seek in Him the solution of the mystery of decrees and election, sovereignty and free will. . . . In similar language we may speak of our doctrine of sin. We are trying to view it in the light of its relation to Christ and His redemption. . . .

"We maintain no less strongly than of old the absolute necessity of this redemption as supernatural and divine. We are learning that it can be made effectual not only to save the individual, but to renovate society. Our ministers are giving themselves eagerly to the study of sociology, that they may apply the Christian solution to its problems.

"What is called the Catholic doctrine of the Atonement, namely, that Christ's death was in some true sense the objective ground of our forgiveness of sins, still commends itself to the larger number of our Christian people."

There follows a consideration of the probable fate of "the heathen," and then these closing sentences, "The outlook is one of hopefulness. Our faces are toward the light." It would be difficult to discover a more representative statement of the spirit of the "new theology" and of its governing principles—continuity with the past, the reinterpretation of old doctrines in new language, the absolute authority and sufficiency of Christian experience, loyalty to the Bible, uncertainty of the final results of biblical criticism, the centrality of the living Christ, the "Christologizing"

of all other doctrines, the obligation to "renovate society," insistence upon the supernatural character of the Christian redemption, expectant optimism toward the immediate future.

IV

In the perspective of half a century, it is clear that what is loosely called "liberal theology," in all its variety of detail was determined mainly by two factors. In part it was a movement of adjustment, of reorientation, of accommodation—of adjustment to a new thought-world which was rapidly winning dominance over men's minds. For them the old orthodoxy had crumbled, and was no longer trustworthy. Its pillars—the inerrancy of Scripture, the authority of Revelation, the assurance of metaphysical certitude, the Sovereignty of God over Nature, the dualism of Nature and the Supernatural, the depravity of man, the reliability of the biblical record, the truth of the Christian scheme of redemption, the uniqueness and finality of Christianity itself—all were rendered insecure. Leaders of the new movement found themselves amidst the ruins, under the necessity of erecting a new structure of belief from unfamiliar materials. Necessarily, their attitude was, in some measure, uncertain, tentative, experimental. Their mood was defensive, apologetic, conciliatory. "Underlying the specific convictions of liberals there is the persistent attempt to make Christianity credible in a scientific age."⁴

But that is not all. Like every other religious development of more than transient significance, like the Reformation and the Wesleyan Revival and the Oxford Movement before it, it was a movement of advance. It sprang from a vivid and dynamic rediscovery of personal Christian experience. That is why any account of the *theological* development badly misses the mark without reiterated stress upon that other movement, in no sense theological, which paralleled trends of thought and furnished the spiritual undergirding for them. Largely through the personal leadership of those two extraordinary colleagues, Dwight L. Moody and Henry Drummond, the evangelist of uncritical orthodoxy and the daring interpreter of the new science, something approaching revival was set loose in the English-speaking world on both sides of the Atlantic. Through their influence, men of ability and imagination were claimed for leadership in the new adventure. Energies were released which carried the practical enterprises

⁴ John C. Bennett, "After Liberalism, What?" which is the most discerning and able appraisal of Liberal Theology which has yet appeared.

of the Church in astounding expansion to the far corners of the earth and into neglected areas of the common life.

Liberal theology, then, was the child of the late nineteenth-century outlook, and of the evangelical experience. Its parentage determined its distinguishing characteristics. To the first, it owed its intellectual perspective and certain fundamental presuppositions. We may speak of five:

1. *Devotion to truth.* Doctor Coffin introduces an able apologia for liberalism thus: "By 'liberalism' is meant that spirit which reveres truth supremely, and therefore craves freedom to ascertain, to discuss, to publish and to pursue that which is believed to be true, and seeks fellowship in its discovery."⁵ He reminds us that it was exemplified in history by Socrates, Cicero, da Vinci, Galileo, Erasmus, Colet, More, Milton and the Cambridge Platonists, and "is congruous with the mind of the central Figure of the gospels." Similarly, Doctor Merrill gives as the first mark of a "liberal Christian," "one who keeps an open mind toward truth. . . . That is to say, he refuses to admit to himself that *any* question is ever irrevocably settled."⁶ How great a release this basic principle, fidelity to truth rather than to tradition, brought to eager young minds of that day it is difficult for a generation which has never known any other intellectual climate fully to appreciate.

2. *Deference to science and the scientific method.* In the new and freer quest for truth, men had not been left without an authoritative teacher. Rather, the authority of dogma had been displaced by the authority of science. "The liberal Christian believes in a thoroughgoing and confident use of the scientific method of determining what is fact. . . . For the scientific method is to him one in heart with the Christian method and spirit, the very method and spirit of Jesus Christ."⁷ It is important to remind ourselves once more of the extent to which deference to science and its findings was a prevailing characteristic of the liberal mind.

3. *Tentativeness, if not agnosticism, as to the possibility of metaphysical certainty.* It has not been sufficiently noted how profoundly the outlook to which liberal theology was heir was penetrated by an enervating metaphysical skepticism, and how far the child was infected by the parental paralysis. Partly, this was a reflection of the avowed tentativeness of science. More largely, however, it was a direct heritage from the influence of

⁵ Henry Sloane Coffin, "Can Liberalism Survive?" in *Religion in Life*, Spring Number, 1935, p. 194.

⁶ William Pierson Merrill, *Liberal Christianity*, p. 27.

⁷ W. P. Merrill, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

Immanuel Kant, with his absolute dichotomy between the realm of phenomena or "things-as-they-appear" of which men may gain a kind of working control through science, and the realm of genuine or ultimate reality, "things-as-they-really-are," to which access for human certainty is completely and forever barred. Kant's dualism furnished the central issue for philosophy in the Nineteenth Century. In Ritschl this dualism became the distinction between truths of fact which are the province of science and philosophy, and judgments of value which are the distinctive province of theology. Through Ritschl, this dualistic view of human knowledge worked its way into the liberal Christian mind where, finding ready alliance with one of the most marked features of the evangelical spirit, it produced indifference to natural theology, disdain of metaphysics, and reliance upon the evidence of religious experience as our sole and all-sufficient guide to the truth about God. To minds of a later generation schooled in a sterner realism which could not so dichotomize God's world, it seemed to propose a "double standard of truth," to subject truth to purely pragmatic testing, and to induce a withering skepticism in men's certainty of God. It was one of the principal causes of the later reaction against liberalism.

4. *Emphasis upon the principle of continuity.* This was the major positive principle of the liberal mind. Professor Bennett has well pointed to its influence on almost every specific concept: "Running through the whole theology of liberalism there has been the assumption of continuity in the world—continuity between revelation and natural religion, between Christianity and other religions, between the saved and the lost, between Christ and other men, between man and God."⁸ And Doctor Merrill again voices the liberal outlook: "The liberal Christian accepts the principle of continuity and refuses to believe that human life has ever been, or ever will be, essentially different from what it is now. To his view there is no 'great gulf fixed' between one age and another, one set of folk and another."⁹

The principle of continuity received its great impetus from the concept of *Evolution*. It found theological expression in the idea of *immanence* which has been called the "most characteristic theological doctrine of the Nineteenth Century." It melted the traditional antithesis of natural and supernatural into a vague *monism*. It was the ground of men's confidence in *progress*. It bred a new and more sympathetic *tolerance toward other*

⁸ *Op. cit.*

⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 23.

religions, and toward no religion. It encouraged men to look into *their own highest experience* for clearest light on the divine nature. It opened the way for a new interpretation of Christ's divinity through his humanity, restoring the *Incarnation* to a central importance for liberal Christians. Above all, it fostered a lofty estimate of *man and of his potentialities for achievement*, both spiritual and material, and eager expectancy of the realization of a Christian society in the early future. These were all characteristic features of the prevailing secular outlook, absorbed within the marrow of liberal theology.

5. *The Liberal Spirit.* This record of debtorship would not be complete without mention of the attitude of dispassionate tolerance, of open-minded receptivity, of confidence in "sweet reasonableness" as well as in the powers of human reason, of modesty in personal profession, of preference for understatement rather than overstatement, of respect for human personality, of loyalty to justice, honor and truth, which characterizes true liberalism everywhere and is one of its most precious gifts to the life of religion.

V

From its other parent, evangelicalism, liberal theology also drew a rich inheritance which was at least four-fold:

1. *The authority of Christian experience.* If the disintegration of traditional dogma had not synchronized with a widespread revival of personal religion, it is difficult to guess what the history of Christian thought in recent times might have been. Certainly it would have been very different from what it was. When Christians could no longer rest upon familiar orthodoxy for the certainty which living faith requires, the more scholarly might look to the new teacher, science. For the great mass of ordinary folk, such recourse would have been quite impracticable. Happily there was available to them the needed assurance in a far more accessible and far surer source—in the witness of their own personal religious life. The Romantic movement had prepared the way by centering attention upon inner experiences. The spirit of the time was subjective, individualistic, mystical. For Christians, the crumbling of external bulwarks—Scripture, Church and dogma—deepened the mood of uncertainty, of introspection. And now there swept through their ranks a vivid and all-compelling discovery of the presence of God, "the living Christ," within their own spirits.

Why trouble about formal and external validation when so intimate and so undeniable a certainty ruled their very souls?

"Speak to Him thou for He hears, and Spirit with Spirit can meet—
Closer is He than breathing, and nearer than hands and feet."

In this nearer and surer pathway, liberal theologians followed. This was clearly foreshadowed in the account by Doctor Stearns from which we made extensive quotation above. "The surf on our coast of Maine might as easily overthrow the granite cliffs against which it breaks as criticism and rationalism disturb the Christian realities which stand firm in the experience of the individual believer and the church." "We rest more strongly than ever upon the proof . . . furnished by . . . the old *testimonium Spiritus Sancti internum*."¹⁰ It was reiterated in every characteristic confession of the liberal position throughout the half century. In 1898, on the occasion of his inauguration as professor of systematic theology, Dr. William Adams Brown said:

"What is this work to which you call me? . . . Are the doctrines which form the subject-matter of our science dogmas to be received on authority, irrespective of their contents; or are they living convictions, born of experience, and maintaining themselves in spite of all opposition because of the response which they wake in the hearts and consciences of men? . . .

"It is this connection with experience which gives to the work of the theologian at once its dignity and its interest. He is not concerned with matters which lie in some mysterious realm, above the reach and control of human reason. He has to do with the religious life itself. . . ."¹¹

In the same year there came from the pen of William Newton Clarke the first attempt at a comprehensive and systematic exposition of the "new theology" and one of the most influential books of the century, which opened with these sentences:

"Theology is preceded by religion as botany by the life of plants. Religion is the reality of which theology is the study. . . . Theology thus deals only with the realities which make up religion, and with them only as they enter into religion."¹²

In theology, the position was most fully worked out by Ritschl with his determination to rest the whole weight of Christian faith upon the experience of reconciliation through Christ. Ritschl was the most influential theo-

¹⁰ *Op. cit.*, pp. 537, 539. A year earlier (1890) Doctor Stearns had published a widely influential book, *The Evidence of Christian Experience*, in which this position was first clearly set forth.

¹¹ William Adams Brown, *Christ the Vitalizing Principle of Christian Theology*, pp. 19-20.

¹² *An Outline of Christian Theology*, pp. 1, 2.

logian of the late Nineteenth Century, and the principal teacher of American liberal thinkers.

2. *The centrality of Jesus Christ.* At the heart of the experience which was to furnish both source and norm for liberal theology was the person of Christ. To some, this central place was occupied by the figure of the historical Jesus, made vividly living and contemporary by studies of biblical scholars and by more popular portraiture based upon these researches. To others, however, it was the Living Christ, known as a friendly presence within one's own soul, who was central. For many, the two were merged as a single "fact of religious experience." In any case, liberal theology was through and through Christocentric.

Here, again, illustration might be drawn from the whole range of liberal theological writing. On this point also Stearns was prophetic: "We are coming more distinctly to recognize the central place of the living Christ in our theological thought."¹³ It was the *objective* fact of the life and work of the historic Jesus which was to safeguard the "theology of experience" from unchecked subjectivism. To the question, "What is the Christian religion?" Harnack, the most brilliant of Ritschl's disciples, replied: "The answer seems to be simple and at the same time exhaustive: Jesus Christ and his Gospel."¹⁴ Doctor Merrill once again voiced the central affirmation of contemporary liberals: "Whatever else may be doubtful about the religion and theology of the liberal Christian, this is sure, that it loses itself and finds itself wholly in Christ. . . . The liberal would move, live and have his whole being in Christ."¹⁵ And Browning, poet supreme of Liberal Christianity, could cry:

"I say, the acknowledgment of God in Christ
Accepted by thy reason, solves for thee
All questions in the earth and out of it."

3. *Loyalty to the historic faith.* In striking contrast to other branches of the liberal movement which did not maintain their center of reference within the Church—whether "scientific" or "Platonic" or "speculative"—liberal evangelicalism was determined to remain fully within the stream of historic Christian development. At first this was accomplished by use of the principle of growth so congenial to the thought of the time; the new

¹³ *Op. cit.*, p. 540.

¹⁴ Adolph Harnack, *What Is Christianity?* (1900), p. 10.

¹⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 48.

theology is the "fuller flowering" of what had been implicit in traditional beliefs. Later, recourse was had to the principle of "reinterpretation"; modern theology is merely a translation of the truths of the ancient faith into language understandable to the present age. Finally, to assure living connection of the new with the old, liberalism came more and more to rely upon a distinction given wide currency through the teaching of Doctor Fosdick—the recognition of "abiding experiences in changing categories." Not only does the language of theology change. So also do the concepts which that language seeks to express. But the "experiences" which lie behind the concepts are the same from one generation to another. Thus identity with the historic faith was established through the "principle of continuity"; and the locus of continuity was discovered in the depths of personal "religious experience."

4. *Missionary compassion.* Evangelicalism, however, was in no sense mainly a theological development. Rather, it was a resurgence of warm and vibrant spiritual vitality. Its genius was for propagation rather than for formulation. It lifted men's vision to the horizons of their world. It deepened their insight into the realities of their own corporate life. It quickened their consciences to a thousand needs and injustices and opportunities which had largely escaped the attention of a more rigid orthodoxy. Above all, it filled them with an almost unbelievable and quite unquenchable assurance of what the spirit of Christ, through them, might accomplish—here and now, immediately, in this generation, and in every aspect of mankind's life. And it steeled them in unmeasured devotion, that that hope might be translated into fact. It was fecund, germinative, prolific, to an extent hardly paralleled by any other moment in Christian history. The result was, that in the short space of less than half a century, there came forth from it the most remarkable series of movements for the improvement of human life and the spread of the Christian faith in the nineteen centuries of our era. First, heightened missionary devotion which has planted the Christian Church in almost every land on earth. Then conviction of the responsibility of Christianity to determine the structure of society as well as the life of individuals, already foreshadowed in the Christian Socialist Movement of 1848. Then compassion for the underprivileged in great cities, in industrial communities and in rural and neglected areas. Then a new concern for the "Christian nurture" of the young. And lastly, "conviction of sin" over the divisions among Christians, and a vision of the

reunited Body of Christ, in America and throughout the world. In addition, mention should be made of a dozen secular reforms inspired by its influence. It seems not too much to say that, in the measure that liberal theology has continued to drink deep from this original source of its vitality, it has remained virile and valid, and has won the right to endure.

VI

The history of liberal theology during the half century is largely a summary of more specific developments which cannot be detailed here—changing views of Jesus and of the historical origins of Christianity under advancing biblical criticism; successive stages in the rapprochement of theology and science; developing interpretations of the social mission of Christianity—from the utopian idealism of the early decades to the social humanitarianism of the pre-War period to the more drastic social radicalism of today; altered conceptions of human nature, revealed in both the Social Gospel and the religious education movement; modification in the Church's estimate of other cultures and religions, and especially of its own culture; above all, shifting confidence as to the validity of the liberal movement itself. Within the half century, four periods are distinguishable—the beginnings in the eighties and nineties, the nineties to the World War, the War to the Depression, and the Present Situation. Those divisions might not unfairly be characterized—"the evangelical impact," "pre-War optimism," "disillusionment and uncertainty," "self-examination and new beginnings."

Twice during the period, liberalism has been subjected to especially heavy attack—first from the camp of conservatism in the Fundamentalist agitation, and then from the opposite direction by the advocates of non-theistic Humanism. Both disturbances were relatively short-lived. Neither effected significant modification.

Viewing liberal theology in its entirety, the great changes have occurred in inner "mood" rather than in fundamental principles. And it is clear that these changes have been mainly determined by its attitude toward, and its relations with, its secular environment—the world of modern thought and life. Recognizing again the four periods, that attitude toward the surrounding culture has been successively—hesitant but cordial receptivity, in which the main concern was "to carry over into this new modern world as much as possible of conservative biblical Christianity"; glad accept-

ance, in which the effort was to domesticate Christian thought fully within the modern outlook; almost unconscious weakening of confidence in the face of the post-War world and the Church's manifest loss of vitality; withdrawal and sharp reaction. But the underlying principles are unchanged. In that sense, liberal theology has been a unity.

VII

Clearly, recoil from liberalism is the most important feature of the present situation in theology. If the reaction in America has been neither so extreme nor so complete as on the continent of Europe, it has touched the thinking of every contemporary theologian and is forcing fundamental re-examination of the premises and tenets of Christian theology in the last half-century.

We who stand within the shadow of this criticism lack perspective fairly to appraise the justice of its indictment or the validity of the position from which it is recoiling. In particular, those who are the children of the liberal movement should guard themselves against the familiar vices of the younger generation—unfairness and ingratitude toward their parentage. We can, however, report the alleged inadequacies.

The main burden of the current criticism is a simple one. Theology in the past fifty years has been deeply enmeshed in the dominant secular outlook, sharing its presuppositions, partnering its enterprises, glorying in its utopian anticipations. That outlook is now definitely discredited. Criticism has proven its premises invalid. The passage of events has branded its expectations absurd. It must be discarded. Liberal theology, its child, must likewise suffer drastic reconstruction, if not abandonment. "In the new enterprise the watchword will be not, Accommodate yourself to the prevailing culture! but, Stand out from it and challenge it. . . . We cannot harmonize Christ Himself with modern culture. What Christ does to modern culture is to challenge it."¹⁶

More specific weaknesses are discovered at every major point in the liberal position. Even the principle of loyalty to truth rather than tradition is suspect; the quest for truth, it is held, is necessarily an aristocratic, a privileged, an intellectualistic enterprise; in the Christian view, truth alone is not the ultimate and all-sovereign human value, but rather love expressed

¹⁶ Harry Emerson Fosdick, "Beyond Modernism."

in rich, full-orbed spiritual personality; this must guide both thought and action.

Criticism is further directed against the basic metaphysical premise of liberal theology—its view of the ways by which men may win secure knowledge of God, and the extent and character of that knowledge when won. Child of the dominant nineteenth century outlook, it tended to accept the prevailing dualism between the realm of Nature with which science was alone competent to deal and the realm of human values and spiritual experience which was the exclusive province of religion, and the prevailing skepticism as to the possibility of reaching ultimate metaphysical certainty. Liberalism freed itself from an exaggerated dualism of Nature and the Supernatural only to fall victim to this less defensible dualism. This was the legacy from Kant, transmitted through Ritschl, which has "strangled and cursed the religious thought of our time." If theologians put their trust in science, their theology tended to be abstract, impoverished, sterile. If, discarding natural theology, they relied wholly on the testimony of religious experience, their position was open to a steadily deepening suspicion of subjectivism and invalidity. In either case, the dualism remained. But, it was the dualism itself which was unsound. By a century-long effort, philosophy has finally nearly shaken itself loose from this false and devastating dualism. With the dualism overcome, the most common first premise of liberal theology is no longer valid.

Again, the appeal to "Christian experience" does not provide a sound and adequate escape from the dilemma. There are questions which cannot be evaded:

"Just what do we mean by 'experience'? Are Christian experiences all alike? If not, how shall we determine whose experience is reliable in cases where Christians differ? Is not 'experience' a subjective thing, anyway? . . . Will not the investigation of experience lead to the discovery of psychological causes for the experience rather than to a system of divine causation?"¹⁷

The position was developed in a day when most people could be assumed to be possessors of a "Christian experience," thoroughly grounded in the Scriptures and a heritage of generations of life within the Church. To those bereft of such grounding and such heritage, the "appeal to experience" has little meaning.

Hardly less enduring as a center of certainty was its appeal to the

¹⁷ Gerald Birney Smith, *Current Christian Thinking*, p. 85.

historic Christ. Advancing biblical study has changed the lineaments of that figure with baffling and disconcerting rapidity. Whatever the final outcome of criticism, Christianity is a far greater, far profounder, far grander thing than Harnack's simple formula. It cannot be comprehended in its fullness without attention to its continuing life and growth and travail in the Church "which is His body." And it cannot be adequately apprehended by the individual "in his solitariness"; but only as his life is guided, nurtured, chastened and redeemed within the community of his fellows. Dim recognition of this fact explains the reviving interest in "the Church," the extraordinary influence upon contemporary theology of the great Catholic lay-theologian, the late Baron von Hügel, and the widespread yearning for a "Catholic Christianity."

Nor was liberalism's favorite device to preserve continuity with historic Christianity—the recognition of "abiding experiences in changing categories"—more than a temporary resting point for a harassed and puzzled apologetic. Theological categories are supposed to represent objective realities rather than subjective experiences. It is the existence of the realities rather than the worth of the experiences which has been at stake in the modern world. Furthermore, the proposed solution easily becomes an attempt to continue outworn experiences as well as outmoded categories into a new world which can find no legitimate place for either. The experiences characteristic of the evangelical Christianity of the past generation have evaporated almost as completely as its overconfident theological certainties. To this new day, it seems to make profession of a veritable armory of postulates in an age which demands few beliefs, but wishes them stamped with the mark of absolute certainty.

There is a deeper query here. And a very practical one. Most of the formulators of liberal theology first confronted its problems in their maturity. Their personal piety had been nurtured in the atmosphere of the old evangelicalism. To many it appeared that they suffered not only from a dualism in their theology, but a dualism between their theology and their experience. Was the former, developed from the intellectual premises of the prevailing secular outlook, adequate to justify the latter, born of a rich and confident evangelism? Their theism proposed an attenuated and unsure God; their faith held firm to the indubitable Sovereign of their fathers. Their criticism of the Bible offered a vague and unimpressive figure of Jesus; they still worshiped the "measure of the stature of the fullness of

Christ." Their theory assigned a most uncertain validity to prayer; but they continued its practice with old-time devotion. As more than one student remarked of his liberal teacher, "He preaches with the voice of Modernism, but he prays with the fervor of the old Orthodoxy."

Here we confront one of the most serious practical weaknesses of liberal Christianity. The outreach of its influence into new areas of life was prodigious; but it was deficient in self-propagation. Its religious experience was not inheritable by its children. In any event, in very considerable measure, it was *not* transmitted. Was this because its intellectual premises were inadequate, because it had divorced itself from the foundations of faith upon which it had been reared and without which its life could not be continued beyond the one generation? A vine, transplanted from its native climate to new conditions, may continue to live with apparently undiminished vigor. But it will not seed and produce progeny. So it was with the evangelical experience in the new intellectual climate of liberalism.

The deeper dissatisfaction with liberalism, however, has sprung directly out of the public events of today, and concerns those features of the liberal faith which underlie its theory of society—its high estimate of man's nature, its confidence in his response to reason and ideals, its utopian proposal to create a "warless world" and a "Christian social order." These assumptions, it is held, are naïve, self-deceived and, in some measure, hypocritical. And they are without warrant in a profounder Christian insight. "The liberal culture of modernity is defective in both religious profundity and political sagacity. . . . It understands neither the heights to which life may rise nor the depths to which it may sink. . . . It is quite unable to give guidance and direction to a confused generation which faces the disintegration of a social system and the task of building a new one."¹⁸

The reaction from liberalism is revealed not only in these criticisms, but also in the positive position which is beginning to emerge. Like all developments of thought which have not yet found themselves, its meaning is best discovered in the phrases to which it instinctively has recourse. Of these two are especially prominent—"realistic theology" and "Catholic Christianity." The new movement seeks to be more realistic—both in its certainty of God and in its understanding of man and his society. It acknowledges the indubitable reality, majesty and priority of the living God. And it confesses the inherent willfulness of man, and the necessity

¹⁸ Reinhold Niebuhr, *Reflections on the End of an Era*, pp. 14, ix.

for drastic dealing with the results both in individual lives and in the body politic. This explains the oft-repeated statement that it is moving "politically to the left and theologically to the right." On the other hand, it reaches out after a "Catholic Christianity." That is to say, it feels impelled to seek firm grounding, not in the thought-forms of modern culture or even of traditional Protestantism, but in the rich, deep stream of tested certainty which has come down through the life of the Church through all the Christian centuries. It wishes to find a place within that Catholic tradition and to drink deep of its wisdom and its faith. To that end, the Church takes a position of centrality, for theology and for personal piety.

VIII

The issue of the present transition cannot be predicted. Ideally the advance beyond liberalism would be through the piecemeal analysis of its presuppositions, careful separation of the invalid from the permanently valuable, and embodiment of the latter in a new and more adequate structure. Actually, movements of human thought follow no such logical pattern. More frequently, a quite new development born of the necessities of its own time displaces the old, often ruthlessly discarding true values and childishly oblivious to its debtorship. Often it represents an extreme and equally onesided reaction. By such pendulum-swings, theology lurches forward. The present phase may lead out into a sounder and more enduring apprehension of Christian faith. It may yield a theology even more partial and inadequate, to be shortly outmoded with the next transition in the common life. It may issue in a purified and more worthy liberalism.

Whatever the future, this much is sure. The liberal movement in its positive outreach—fidelity to the outlook and faith of the historic Jesus, vision of mankind's life brought wholly under the ideal of Christ, reasoned but hopeful expectation of man's response to Christ's faith in them, self-giving compassion for all men everywhere—represents something *new* in Christian history of quite incalculable importance. In the perspective of later ages, it will take its place—with Paul's discovery of the indwelling Christ, with Augustine's comprehension of grace, with Saint Francis' glorification of the whole creation, with Luther's recovery of the freedom of the Christian man, with Tauler's and Fox's awakening to the "inner light"—as one of the great creative advances in the consummation of Christian thought.

The Organic Principle of the Church

RUSSELL HENRY STAFFORD

IT is primarily for morale that society depends upon organized religion. There are many kinds of social morale, as there are many kinds of religion. Folk-faiths have in general been conservative of established folk-ways through a system of taboos. Prophetic faiths have in general stimulated change in the direction of improvement. Since the days of the Caesars, when it worked as a leaven within the Empire, Christianity at its best has created and sustained the kind of morale which promotes moral revolution and a higher, wider justice, while deprecating civic violence.

Never was social morale of this sort more needed than at present throughout the world, and not least in America. In contrast with it we have the whites or reactionaries on the one hand and the reds or radicals on the other, both of them despairing of things as they are and advocating reform through forcible breach of political continuity. If history teaches anything, it teaches that progress is to be won only at calamitous cost along either the Fascist or the Communist route. The hope of healthy and enduring advance is tied up with the triumph of the typical Christian morale, another name for which is constructive liberalism.

It seems evident that our Roman Catholic brethren are making as great a contribution as can be expected of them along this line. Far from being absorbed in antique otherworldly dogmatism, the Catholic Church is alert to the challenges of the current social situation. Since the pontificate of Leo XIII it has been officially committed, with enlightenment and candor, to the cause of human betterment in this world, as the champion at once of the rights of the common man and of orderly procedure in vindicating them. The National Catholic Welfare Conference is one of the most enlightened bodies in America. And the extraordinary loyalty of Catholics to their Church gives it enormous influence. Perhaps the mightiest factor in America today making for stable progress, as against the disruptive trends of reaction and of radicalism alike, is the equable tone of the social idealism thus inculcated in our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens.

The non-Catholic Christian bodies are not behind the Catholic body in their social thinking. Almost without exception the Protestant churches

of America are on record in advocacy of great steps forward out of present chaos toward a sound and equitable order, and also, by inference at least, against any and all departures from legality to accomplish these steps. But on the whole they seem to be without effectual influence upon their constituents, either in restraint or in stimulation. Their resolutions on social questions are little more than resolutions, and a dead letter. In protecting the public sanity while elevating the public ideal, evangelical Christianity is not pulling its weight nowadays.

I have chosen this social approach to the discussion of the Church because I conceive it to be of the essence of the gospel that its proponents should be tremendously concerned for the coming of the kingdom of God on earth, which I take to mean a social order righteous throughout. And in the contrast in church loyalty between the Catholic and the non-Catholic bodies I believe that we can find the prime reason for the comparative weakness of Protestantism in this regard.

Numerically the Protestant churches are stronger now than they have ever been before. Their rolls are crowded with names. But their pews are not always crowded with people. Among us much more than among Catholics, church affiliation is likely to be a matter of social convention, having little if any connection with the nerves governing conduct. We must achieve a stronger churchmanship before we can achieve our proper social influence, or indeed do our duty along any other line.

Various remedies have been suggested for this notorious weakness of churchmanship among Protestants. We are told, for instance, that, if only Protestantism could achieve doctrinal unity our churches would command the respect they are now wanting. Multiplicity of counsels begets confusion and disaffection.

But that is a very intellectual view of the subject. And there are very few intellectual people, Christians or others. To be sure, such as there are, they are of prime importance for leadership. Their demands must be met, or the Christian faith will not move forward. We neglect at grave peril the task of restating Christian truth in terms which will justify it to the intellect. And a firm philosophical persuasion ought perceptibly to underlie every pulpit discourse of every type. Nevertheless, metaphysical controversy plays no conspicuous part nowadays in vernacular conversations. It is a clever preacher who can devise a directly theological sermon which will not be received with yawns.

The points on which Protestants divide, moreover, are pretty abstruse, and of little or no common interest. We have got beyond the day when the divisive note was harped upon in the pulpit. The points on which Protestants agree, on the other hand, except for Fundamentalists at one extreme and Humanists at the other, are all the important points of faith, from the viewpoint of the man in the street or the pew. If we were to expound with one voice a unified Christian theology complete at all points, he might not respect us as much as he does now. For he is as familiar as we are nowadays with the limitations of human certainty, and like us is a bit of a skeptic about sheer dogmatism. Even the modern Catholic layman would probably cease to be a Catholic if his Church tried to hold him only by its massive creed, which in fact he swallows because it goes along with something else much more precious.

Again, we are often admonished that if only the churches would unite on a concerted social program they could sway and remold the world as they are not now doing. Why do we not all get together, and decide exactly what is wrong with the capitalistic system, or the present administration at Washington, or what not, and arrive at a definite conclusion as to the changes called for, and then tell our people just what they must do in order to bring these changes about?

Now that is a very attractive suggestion, provided, first, that all civic wisdom resides in the clerical and especially in the secretarial mind—since most church bodies are dominated by professionals under the delusive forms of democracy—and, second, that the layman is quite ready and content to surrender his social intelligence and civil initiative into the keeping of his church. Those provisions will be fulfilled, however, when roses bloom out-of-doors in a New England January. The one is as much against nature as the other.

The layman's objection to direct political guidance by the Church does not spring necessarily from recalcitrance to Christian principles. He knows, as we professional religionists ought to know, that political details belong to the domain of the State, not to that of the Church, and that religion is entitled to enter that domain mainly through the conscience of the free and responsible individual citizen. He will go on rendering unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's. He looks to the Church, and rightly so, for social morale, not for political technique. Far from being the road

to recovery, a united attempt to dictate the constitution of a new theocracy would be our road to final ruin.

A more plausible hint is to be found in the suggestion that our churches do not get close enough to the lives of our people. The Church needs more and better parish activities to engage the vigorous participation of its adherents. But this prescription hardly touches the heart of the matter.

Far be it from me to belittle the place of living and working together, in supplement of listening to sermons together, as a factor of crucial necessity in the program of the living Church. Nevertheless there are two telling offsets to this argument that we could win our people to a deep church loyalty merely by expanding our departmental programs. First, the tendency of late in most churches has not been to neglect this undertaking but to overdo it, without perceptible heightening of spiritual tone. Second, parish activities, regarded as ends in themselves, rather than as channels of expression for impulses specifically religious, are not significantly different from club activities without any religious association whatever. Yet no one thinks of a club as the home of his heart.

We have been looking thus far in vain for the secret we seek, because we have been looking in the wrong directions. Ask any thoughtful Catholic what holds him to the Church, and he will tell you that it is its sacramental life, and especially the blessed sacrament of the altar. It is only the ignorant Catholic who is held by fear, and it is only the ignorant Protestant who will entertain such an idea of intelligent Catholics. They are held by love, which centers in the sacred offices of the Church.

The Catholic bodies emphasize the sacraments because they regard them as the indispensable channels of grace. Sacramentarianism is indeed the distinctive and defining element in the Catholic position—that in general, rather than any special theory of orders alone. This is a view which we cannot take. But it may be that it is to be interpreted as a rationalization by the Catholics of an element in religion far deeper than this dogma, and capable of being regarded in a different light without sacrifice of any of its cogency.

The sacraments are offices of worship. The Holy Communion is for all Christians the supreme act of worship. Worship is the nucleus of Catholic churchmanship. That may well lead us to conclude that the secret we are seeking for the Protestant churches in their need is to be

found in a renewed emphasis upon worship as the proper nucleus among Protestants also of that churchmanship of which we feel the lack so acutely.

So we must begin by framing a new definition of the Church. That implies, and rightly, that in essence the Church is an idea. Ideas are the most pervasive embodiments in our experience of the spiritual. For the spiritual is that which is real, but not perceptible by the physical senses. The Church is basically not a material, that is to say an extended and historic, but a spiritual reality. It is an idea before it is a fact. It becomes a fact wherever that idea is realized in time and space. Just as an idea can be present without division in many minds at once, so the Church is wholly present wherever its spiritual nature is apprehended and exemplified among men. That is why we can properly speak of the Church, without any limiting adjective, when we refer to any church at any date in any place.

At least two ideas of the Church in which worship is not stressed have long been prominent in Christian thinking. The idea of the Church as an institution has much to commend it. For certainly the Church must assume an institutional phase wherever it exists. It must have officers, rules, and funds, in order to do its work. But that only one kind of institution can be a true church, that its officers must be a hierarchy set apart by special rites in an exclusive succession in order to exercise a valid ministry, and that the basic formularies of belief must be uniform among all members of the Church, are views which manifestly depart from the truth because they explicitly deny the authenticity of collective Christian experience under any other norms than those laid down by some particular body as orthodox. No fact in religion would seem to be more undeniable, however, than that evidence of genuine fellowship with God and the enjoyment of divine favor occurs often in situations the most unorthodox from the viewpoint of any previously established religious institution.

He who claims that his church is a divine institution is usually right up to that point. But when he goes on to allege that no other church but his can be divine, he is palpably wrong.

The idea of the Church as primarily a movement, taking many forms in accommodation to shifting circumstances, but true to itself through all changes of organization and method so long as it moves toward the actualizing of the Christian ideal on earth, is clearly preferable to the idea of the Church as a static establishment. For it takes in much that the other leaves out, while the criterion of genuineness which it implies is a telling one, pro-

vided we know definitely enough what the Christian ideal is to make no mistakes as to the diverse forms it can rightly assume in different social contexts.

But that is a kind of knowledge which probably no one can justly claim to possess in full. And, even if we had it, under the limitations of this formula we should be confining the Church to its effects in the temporal order, whereas the Church always knows herself to be in the first instance a witness to the eternal order, and can move in a desirable direction up the stream of time only under the impulse of a transcendental certitude. Not until our thought has taken that certitude and its source into its reckoning, and made them basic, can our idea of the Church be adequate.

When from institution and movement we turn to worship as the cardinal principle of the Church, the way opens up toward an idea fundamentally satisfying. Not as proof-texts but as road-directions one may cite in this connection two sayings of our Lord. "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them"—what is that then but a church? And when He overturned the tables of the chaffering merchants in the Temple courts, that sacred precinct which for all Jewry was the very Church of God translated into stone and mortar, He quoted with approval from the second Isaiah, "My house shall be called a house of prayer."

Suppose we say, then, that the Church is the fellowship of Christians praying together. Here is a definition wide enough to take in all creeds and politics, high enough to touch heaven, and subtle enough to exclude many whom all the orthodoxies take in while it includes many whom they shut out. And in it the emphasis falls precisely where it is laid, though in a faulty form, by sacramentarianism, which we have found to be the key of Catholic attachment to the Church.

Of course the adequacy of this idea depends upon what we mean by prayer. If we mean a merely conventional verbal exercise, in which God's name is mentioned but His presence is not felt, we are taking insincerity at its own conspicuously false valuation. If we mean an apostrophe of the Divine, however rapt and heated at the moment, which prompts to no expressive action and has no sequel in consonant conduct, we are dignifying religious hysteria with a name it does not deserve. We must take prayer at its best, if it is to be the touchstone of the true Church.

In prayer at its best—in real prayer—whatever words are used and

whatever specific bounties may be prayed for, two things always occur. There is heartfelt acknowledgment of God and honest recognition of His presence. And an impulse is engendered for performance in conformity with His nature and will. Whether in the form of an address to God or not, whatever act produces this twofold realization is true prayer. And in proportion to the depth of impression as to God will be the urgency toward expression in obedience to Him.

So to define the Church as the spiritual household of prayer is not to belittle its other aspects as a movement, functioning through institutions as all successful movements must do. It is not to belie the Church's call to human service, or to decry the manifold activities by means of which it responds to that call. The Church's activities are its limbs. The heart of the Church is prayer. The life of the Church is the realized presence of God, which is what keeps her heart beating.

The Church is the fellowship of praying Christians. As Christians, they pray in the name of Jesus. What that phrase means is that all Christians take Jesus as in some sort their index to the character of God. No creedal intricacies are involved in that position. Trinitarian or Unitarian, no man can with historic accuracy call himself a Christian who does not believe that Jesus is at heart like God, and therefore God is like Jesus, so that we can pray as if we were speaking to Jesus Himself.

I am using the personal name Jesus instead of the official title Christ deliberately, to make it clear that the Head of the Church is not some eternal Christ problematical in disposition, as some have seemed to suppose, but a spiritual being strictly continuous and of identical moral quality with the Jesus of the Gospels. A spiritual being Jesus still indubitably is, at least with that sort of reality which belongs to a potent idea, whether or not the Man Himself still lives and is one in power and presence with God, as I believe. Nothing is to be predicated of Christ which could not be appropriately attributed to the Man Jesus as we find Him in the gospels. No mystical revelation of His disposition or purpose is to be accepted as a divine leading which will not check with this documentary control.

We are followers of a Man, of whom enough is on record to tell us what He was really like, despite all flaws and obscurities in these sources. Many misleading and injurious vagaries of faith might have been prevented if Christendom had always been mindful of that fact. Whether this Man be God or not, it is on His representation of God's nature that we govern

our approach to God. He is the Head, we are the members in that fellowship of prayer which, wherever it occurs, embodies the concept, the spiritual reality of the Church.

It is possible, to be sure, for Christians to pray together and to work together in expression of the impulse to serve which true prayer imparts, without setting up a church in the sense of an organization so designated. That takes place in most gatherings of Christians for any religious purpose. But every such gathering is, strictly speaking, a church for the time being. The Church as an institution and a movement is a congregation habitually assembling for regular worship. Habit and regularity are extensions of the practice of worship for certain ends going beyond worship itself. Yet if worship be present any society is a church, actually as well as essentially, provided it be the center of their religious behavior for its members, however its officers may be inducted and its business transacted, and whatever may be its tenets beyond the acknowledgment of God as Jesus has made Him known.

So the primal unit of the Church is a worshipping congregation. Congregations banded together into denominational aggregates by a common rule and common interests, separately from other Christians, are provinces of the Church Universal. No one of them can be the Church Universal, to the exclusion of other praying Christians. For the Church Universal is made up of all the praying Christians in the world. Everyone belongs to it who is a follower of Jesus and who prays with others of His followers, whether or not he is a member of any one congregation in good and regular standing according to its rules.

But he will become a member of some congregation if and when prayer and the fellowship of others who pray mean enough to him to make him take religion seriously. And in the fellowship of prayer he will discover religious values which cannot be apprehended in solitary devotion. For religion is a social achievement, like everything else that is meaningful in life, since man is a social being, and can find himself only in relation with others of his kind.

"Ye are fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God," said Saint Paul. He said it with reference to church membership. The Church is the visible kingdom of Christ on earth. Christ is the Lord of every praying Christian, and of them all collectively. He is not perfectly obeyed by any of His subjects. There are often disorder and mismanage-

ment in His realm; even civil war is not unknown, while corruption in its officialdom may sometimes be rampant and is never wholly absent. Nevertheless His realm the Universal Church remains. He has no other on earth. And when all men shall be praying Christians His kingdom will have come in its fullness.

That seems at present a remote eventuality. But in the meantime this citizenship is open to us, and as citizens we can do our part to improve administration, reduce friction, and extend the borders of the domain by peaceful penetration of territories as yet unsubdued to Christ's sway. That is so obviously what every Christian is summoned to do by his conscience, that it seems hardly conceivable that anyone with this understanding of what the Church means should prefer not to assume a citizen's responsibility in the Kingdom, but to remain a man without a country instead.

To this appeal in behalf of the Church, as represented by some congenial congregation to every man, for his support and aid, must be added a summons to his gratitude. For the Church is not only Christ's visible earthly kingdom, to which civic loyalty is due. She is also our Mother, to whom filial devotion is due. It is the Church, as the fellowship of praying Christians, which has helped us discover our individual ideals, and has sponsored all those social changes for the better to date which have made Western civilization, despite its blots and blemishes, so incalculably superior to all others the world has seen in care for us common men at all normal seasons.

Vice, graft, war, these have always been among men; and, alas, they still continue, even in Christendom. But they continue under protest, and not with general approval or consent. On the other hand, justice and mercy have been brought to a pitch elsewhere unparalleled in lands imbued by the Church, however insufficiently, with Jesus' spirit of inclusive and sacrificial good will. It is the age-long progressive regard for these qualities in social living, rather than our recent much vaunted but more or less fortuitous technological achievements, which has given to the culture of Christendom that distinction which all other peoples recognize and would emulate, however reluctant we may be, in our acute awareness of surviving faults and errors, to boast of them.

This solicitude for universal justice and mercy has come into life through the influence not of statesmen or philosophers or scientists as such, but of praying Christians. We have been atmospherized in that

influence all our lives, and so were our fathers before us. We should not have lived at all if the Church had not created the favorable conditions which made possible life as we know it. If much remains to be done to make life tolerable for all, much has been done already, and it is the Church that has done it. In gratitude for her maternal tenderness, cradling the better world that is to be, every man ought to cleave to her and join himself to her continuing labors, that out of common prayer and action new bounties may be brought forth for generations yet to come.

The fact that we have framed our definition of the Church, as the spiritual household of prayer in the name of Jesus, in the interest of formulating an effectual challenge and invitation to church loyalty, raises the question whether this new orientation proposed for Protestantism is to be motivated simply by a utilitarian consideration—whether worship ought to be restored to centrality chiefly or wholly for the reason that a system of worship similar to the Catholic sacramental system may be expected to have a similar effect upon church members in eliciting a deeper loyalty to the Church. There is need to bring this question into the open. For tacitly many things are done in our churches, if I mistake not, with a view to their effect on human witnesses, which resemble and are copied from things done among Catholics with an almost completely objective intention, premising God Himself as their object.

This subjectivism has done much to vulgarize and even to vitiate the Protestant cultus. It is responsible for a feeling of unreality in many of our rites and festivals, for the presence of the pretty-pretty and the absence of solemnity in them. Of course if God is a human construct, then the subjective appeal to worshipers is the only reality in worship, and the best we can do is to develop that appeal as far as possible, while regretting that as a matter of fact there is no substantively real God to be there and hear our prayers. Nor would I bring any interference or indictment to bear upon a man who holds that God is no more than a human construct, except to insist that he has no place within the historic Christian tradition, and would be more honest if he stepped out of the Christian movement entirely.

On the other hand, however, if the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is real in the same way that you and I are, only more so, then to pretend to be worshiping Him while we are really concerned mainly with titillating the sensibilities of a congregation is to offer an affront to His Majesty. For it is a virtual denial that He exists, or at least that He

matters. The only subjective consideration which can enter rightfully into the planning and conduct of Christian worship is that it shall be of such a sort as to educe through correspondence with their needs and mood a maximum participation of the congregation in the objectively valid purpose of the occasion.

Certainly worship is not to be emphasized simply because it stimulates church loyalty. But the fact that it does stimulate church loyalty affords us evidence that worship should be put first in the communal observance of religion. Whatever else religion in general may be, the Christian religion is worship first of all. Worship is the channel of grace through which Christians are kept in touch with the Source of all goodness, and thus indirectly are enabled to make their due collective contribution to social morale. If we have made less than our due contribution through the Protestant churches, that means that we Protestants have neglected this primal means of grace. Rebuked, we will return to putting first things first.

The rest will follow in due course. We are glad that it will follow. But that is not our reason for returning. Our reason is that we would do that which is pleasing to God. We can trust Him, that when we are right with Him we shall be strong in His might to serve His cause in this world.

After all, this is involved in our very definition of the Church as the household of prayer. For Christian prayer is never a mere form of words, nor an exercise in self-recollection, nor a device of auto- or group-suggestion. Christian prayer rests upon and springs from the conviction—that is too academic a term for a state of assurance which involves the whole personality, affective and conative, as well as rational; let me rather say, from a vivid realization—that God is, and that He is here. No church deserves any loyalty, except as a club among other clubs equally secular, unless it helps people toward that realization. For that is what people go to church for—because they have it, or in order to get it. No congregation is a church, indeed, however regular it may be in creed and polity, unless its devotions are sincerely predicated upon that wholehearted acknowledgment. But that church, Catholic or Protestant, must needs be loved and revered by its adherents, in which God's actual Presence is felt by the ministrants, and the consciousness of it is through their ministries transmitted with cleansing and energizing power to the worshiping congregation.

It is our custom to call meetings of a Christian congregation by the name of services. To whom is the service rendered? The sole legitimate

Christian answer is that it is rendered to God. He in return does doubtless render service to those who meet Him there, or anywhere else. But in prayer He is the object of our devotion, as we are the objects of His reciprocal solicitude.

Objection is often taken to this view on the ground that it makes God out to be stained with unworthy and even ridiculous vanity, that He should be held capable of being pleased with human adulation, and should seek it. But there is no flattery in Christian prayer. God is our King; we praise His glory. God is our Father; we adore His love. God wants our obedience; we pledge it to Him. God wants to do us a good turn; we let Him know that we are ready to receive it, and shall be grateful.

Any good and generous father wants respect and affection from his children. It is a tribute to them that he does so. It shows that they are important in his sight, and so it is important for him what their attitude toward him is. He pays them a compliment in letting them know that he feels that way about them. He would have them understand that he is not austere, or too busy with other matters; he craves their friendship, their confidence, and to be told of their love.

As God's children, in worship we render this service to our Father. It is a natural tribute on our part, and on His it is natural to want it, though to be sure we can go our way without having anything to do with Him, except along the line of business, if that unfilial course is what we prefer. He does not force Himself upon us; but when we come voluntarily before Him it is like going home to visit our earthly parents. It is no less a service rendered to God because it happens to be a service we like to render.

At no point does ordinary Protestant observance more often fall short than in our stated services of public worship of what our people have a right to expect, because their souls are hungry for it. In every connection at this point we are tempted into slovenliness through not taking God seriously. In the first place, the room where God is worshiped is often without appointments suggestive of this purpose. We ministers are not to blame for the sins of architects. But architecture, whether of the severity of the old New England meeting-house, or of the gorgeousness of true Gothic, or of the specious ugly-prettiness of what I have heard called the steamboat Gothic of the 1870's, is of relatively little importance. What matters is that God's room should be as beautifully clean and orderly as our guestroom at home would be if the President were coming, and should

be reserved for His exclusive use. To be sure, He can put up with anything. And He has to put up with everything, for He is everywhere. But where He is an invited guest the atmosphere should be special to that hospitality, and others who come at His bidding to His chamber should feel that this is a very throne-room, reserved and ordered for the King, and never defiled by any business less than regal.

So with the ordering of worship itself. Many services are conducted on a hit-or-miss plan, with all the joints exposed and all the wheels whirring, without forethought or dignity in details, with catch-penny phrases and silly music, as if God were a good fellow, with whom anything goes. Is it any wonder that people do not take the Church seriously, if the Church does not take God seriously? God is our King and our Father. He does not disdain simplicity, but we can hardly expect Him to be pleased with an offhand carelessness in our demeanor.

In the service, the sermon stands out. It stands out so far that everything else sometimes gets demoted to the rank of preliminary exercises. No doubt the sermon has to stand out in length. But it is the sermon which is in truth a preliminary exercise—preliminary to that realization of God, and of man's duty seen in His light, which is the culminating achievement of true worship, and the very essence of prayer. When the sermon does serve this end it takes on an exalted sacrament value.

In the sermon the preacher stands out. That must be so. But he should stand out as a preacher, that is, a man through whom God is speaking. Too often he permits himself instead to stand out as an individual, speaking for himself, with all his idiosyncrasies displayed, the bald spots in his preparation gleaming, and his vanity as a pulpit performer to the fore. True pulpit eloquence is a by-product of utter sincerity and subtle, cultivated religious intelligence. The spurious eloquence of the facile self-conscious phrasemaker in the pulpit means that God and His message for these people of His have been forgotten. If the minister forgets God, the people may be forgiven for not remembering Him, and for thinking of the church service as a form of entertainment paralleling at best a women's club lecture or a political oration.

Greater in immediate import than the sermon, however, is the formal prayer, by so much as God to whom prayer is addressed is greater than men to whom in God's name (sometimes too lightly taken) the sermon is addressed. I speak of "the formal prayer" for two reasons. First, to dis-

tinguish the pastoral prayer from the rest of the service, all of which is ideally likewise of the nature of true prayer or communion with heaven. Second, by way of rebuke to the scandalous informality of many Protestant public prayers, often amounting to naïve blasphemy. If it were not naïve it would be criminal. Many a man who prepares his sermons with care, just gets up and talks off the top of his mind when he talks to God. And on the top of his mind he is likely to find incoherence, sentimentality, and reckless repetitions of tricks of speech used in earlier services, no less stereotyped than printed prayers and far more uncouth. A man would much better read his prayers mechanically, in words sufficiently studied to have meaning at least for the writer, the congregation, and God, than to harangue the Lord in empty extempore rhetoric.

Again, many a man is only pretending to talk to God when he claims that he is praying in public; he is actually talking to the congregation. It is a good sober decent rule that nothing should ever be said under the form of an address to God which is intended primarily for those in whose behalf the address is made by their spokesman, instead of for God Himself. Much better pray in an unknown tongue, feeling God's presence, than play at praying in brilliant English without really thinking of Him. Congregations come to church, among other things, to be prayed for. But they justly resent being prayed at. They feel, and with reason, that such prayer is not prayer at all. They are being cheated. I remember once seeing a nun reading a book of Latin prayers. "Do you know what these prayers mean, sister?" I asked. "No," she replied, "but God understands Latin, you know!" That nun was really praying; for she knew that God was there. He who believes that God is there will never use prayer as an excuse for hitting his people when they are off their guard.

When God is taken seriously, and all the offices of the Church are discharged in the solemn splendor of that transfiguring awareness on the part at least of the celebrants, people will be glad to be taught to pray as they have not known before, by these pastors of theirs who have led them to perceive that God is real. Most Christians, when they say their prayers, say them by rote, and without change year after year. That is true both of Protestants and Catholics. But practising Catholics often attend retreats at which they are instructed in the art of more searching prayer against a background of directed meditation on sacred subjects. He who judges

Catholic devotions by automatic "Hail Marys" to the click of beads knows very little about the matter.

In the Protestant churches we have made little attempt at such training, except in the old-fashioned prayer-meeting. What the old-fashioned prayer-meeting may have been like in earlier days, I am not able to judge at firsthand. But it had sunk so far into jejune pietistic mawkishness by the days of my youth that I am very glad it has been generally discontinued. I wish that instead we might have in our churches classes in systematic devotion, including practice in the actual writing and revision and subsequent reverent delivery, from notes, if need be, of prayers genuinely expressive of personal religious experience and felt needs. When that is done, we shall have again at least an inner group of men and women in our churches who are on fire with God.

That suggestion I throw out only tentatively, as a hint of one of the directions in which development is called for. But there is nothing tentative about the assurance I feel that Protestantism can be as strong in every legitimate way as Catholicism, if it will lay a like foundation for respect and influence by cultivating the devotional life of the Church, in which all other activities must be centered if they are to be vital. For prayer is the indispensable constitutive element of a true church, whatever its orders or tenets may be. The spirit of devotion is nuclear to all legitimate activities of the Church as a household or divine family, widely varied as they will rightly be in order to meet the needs of our people and to draw still more people from among the unchurched into the charmed circle of Christian fellowship. Not all these activities will or could be of a patently devotional character. Indeed often they may bear the outward semblance of the secular. Yet they will all be organically related to prayer as the bond of the fellowship, if they really belong in the Church's field. And prayer depends for its sustenance upon taking God more seriously than has been our Protestant wont, at least in recent decades.

Blessed Are the Debonair

EARL MARLATT

AT ridiculously regular intervals in the pageant of world-history, God is obsequiously bowed off of the stage of human affairs and the curtain rung down on religion. It happened in latter-day Rome, in Revolutionary France, and now, more recently, in Soviet Russia. It may be happening in humanistic America where ostensibly intelligent men think they are handing down a new revelation when they prate with Alexander Pope and Socrates:

"Know then thyself, presume not God to scan;
The proper study of mankind is man."

This may be true, in a sense, but it is not novel. It is certainly as old as a young Man who presumed to scan God and was crucified because He declared men to be God's sons. Then, as now, there were many to say, "They have taken away the body of our Lord, and we know not where they have laid Him." There were also others whose hearts burned within them as He talked to them by the way; and He was known to them in the breaking of bread.

God has a way of coming back casually into man-made stage-sets which creak mechanically until they are transfigured by His presence. He did it for the ancients so consistently that He became the *Deus ex machina*, who resolved all conflicts and redeemed all tragedies. He did it for the imperial Romans when Constantine suddenly saw the glory of a life as cleansing and light-giving as the midday sun. He may be doing it now for the Russians and other reputed "moderns," according to well authenticated stories which, curiously or miraculously, pierce the darkness and cross the corpse-strewn border of the Soviet Union.

One of them is told by the pastor of a Russian Protestant Church in New York City. He heard it, first-hand, from a childhood friend, who had seen it happen in the Russian village where both of them grew up and learned to love a quiet, genial man, famous as a scholar and yet human

enough, friendly enough to be an unordained father-confessor for the whole village. They called him "The Professor" and went to him for advice in all emergencies.

When the revolution came and most of the intellectuals made a one-way march to a wall at the edge of the village, the professor was not disturbed. So greatly was he loved by his fellow-townsmen that no Red leader, however rabid, dared to touch him. When the university and seminary disappeared, he taught privately and continued openly his ministries of mercy. He didn't mind wearing a cap or addressing anyone he met as "Comrade." He was even consulted occasionally by the local soviet because he could calm the villagers when they were restless. Men like that were useful until the new regime could be definitely established.

One day a detachment of soldiers appeared at the professor's cottage. Their eyes were troubled but their bayonet thrust at the door was delivered with revolutionary "click, snap, and precision." The professor opened the door. He was not alarmed. Squads of soldiers had frequently come for him when the village soviet needed his advice.

"Just a moment, Comrades," he said, "I'll get my cap."

"No," the sergeant barked. (The professor noted with a little concern the omission of the "Comrade.") "You will not need your cap this time. You are going to the wall."

The professor took his place in a hollow square and the long march down the village street began. Before they reached the end of it the whole village knew what was happening. "The Professor" was going to the wall. From all the alleyways came mourning crowds and protesting cries. The soviet had not faced opposition like this before. Their leader was shrewd. The counter-revolution must not have its martyrs. The professor was reprimanded for his "tendencies toward religion" and released. The villagers rejoiced.

A week later the professor walked thirty miles to a city where he knew an orthodox bishop was in hiding. He found the underground chapel, lighted, like the catacombs, by candles, and asked the bishop to ordain him a priest in the Christian Church.

"No," the prelate said. "In times like these that would be virtual suicide."

"Yes," the professor insisted. "I know. I am marked for death. In a day or a fortnight, or a year, I shall go to the wall again and the next

time I shall not come back. In the few months that are left to me I want to do something for God."

He was ordained and went back to the village to wear his cassock openly, proudly, wherever he went. And today, in so far as his American friends know, he remains a bulwark for Christianity against the rising tide of atheism in Soviet Russia.

There is something splendid about that. It savors of the sort of spiritual gallantry, sans "piosity," which Clarence Day, Jr., found in his father, so that without blasphemy he could write a book called *God and My Father*. He eulogizes the same quality in a more recent magazine article about his grandfather's French Bible. Mostly it was a disappointment to him when, as a boy, he was allowed on rare occasions to read it. It made the regal "leviathan" of the King James version the plebeian "*le crocodile*" and instead of the spine-tingling "Behold now Behemoth!" he found without a tremor the commonplace "*Voici l'hippopotame!*" That was no more than small boys shouted at the Zoo: "O look! Here's the hippopotamus!" It wasn't biblical, surely. There was the same sickening sense of let-down when Moses and the Lord were merely "*irrité*," rather than magnificently, divinely "wroth" with the children of Israel. But all of this disgust was swallowed up in ecstasy the day he reached the Beatitudes and found, instead of "Blessed are the meek" (he had never liked that): "*Heureux les debonnaires!*"—"Blessed are the debonair!" That was what his father was, and Galahad, and God. "The Kingdom" belonged to men like that. They would redeem the world.

Waiving the textual problem here—the Greek word translated "debonair" really means "gentle, mild, meek"—the sainted Frenchman responsible for this rendering undoubtedly used the word in its original sense: "of a good disposition, characterized by grace and light-heartedness" . . . gaiety, courtesy, gallantry. Thus construed, debonairness is not the recklessness which leaps from temple spires and expects "legions of angels" to prevent disaster; nor is it the jocund indifference which popular thought idealizes as "nonchalance." For those who believe in signs this may be attained more easily than by going on holy quests or matriculating for holy missions. But for those who crave a less aromatic and more enduring aura debonairness is more dearly bought and less rarely found.

To be debonair is to be high-spirited but not narrow-minded, ardent but not dogmatic, sincere but not intolerant. It is to take one's cause

seriously but one's self not so seriously. It is, then, a kind of meekness which allows differences without rancor, and so promotes individual development through common kindness. That is not far from the kingdom of God as Jesus taught it when He said: "What will a man give in exchange for his soul?" and "Greater love hath no man than this, that he lay down his life"—pour out his spirit lavishly, happily—"for his friends."

It was a debonairness like this which sent Jacopone di Todi to Montefalco, as Helen White writes his biography, in last year's greatest novel, *A Watch in the Night*. At Montefalco the plague-sufferers were lying in windrows around the village square with no one to give them "a cup of cold water" in God's name, or to close their eyes when they were no longer thirsty. Jacopone chose to go to them rather than back to Rome to be chief adviser to the Pope and General of the great Franciscan order. As he knew, he was being obedient to the same heavenly vision which led his patron to marry Lady Poverty and go, singingly, into a world which disliked larks, and lepers and "little poor men." But, like Albert Schweitzer, in another jungle, which needed medicine more than music, he was sure that One would understand, One who said when Mary did a sacrificial, a debonair thing—"ointment of spikenard, precious, very costly"—: "Let her alone. She hath done a beautiful thing. Wherever this gospel is preached throughout the whole world, this also that she hath done shall be spoken of as a memorial of her."

It was of such debonair spirits that Lynn Harold Hough was thinking when he called Robert Louis Stevenson, Henry Drummond, George Matheson, and Wilberforce, "a clan of gallant gentlemen." They were like Naphtali, in the Pentateuch, "a hind let loose" with "goodly words," who came eventually, under the Judges, to "the high places of the field." It was to such that Dwight L. Moody appealed with his gay gospel of duty, transfigured by love into radiant desire, and among such that he found Wilfred Grenfell. And back of Moody was John Wesley, beginning each of the Beatitudes in his own translation of the New Testament with "Happy" rather than "Blessed," and saying, as he faced a grimmer journey than Grenfell's to Labrador: "The best of all is God is with us. God buries His workmen but carries on His work." That was like Elijah letting the flaming mantle of his faith fall upon Elisha, or Jesus, ordaining His disciples: "It is *happier* to give than to receive (this again, according to Wesley's translation). Behold, I send you forth as sheep in the midst of

wolves. Be ye therefore wise as serpents and harmless as doves;" and later, still blithe "amid the encircling gloom": "My Father worketh hither-to and I work. Be of good cheer! I have overcome the world."

To get back over the centuries to the present scene and the men who are trying debonairly to keep God in it, the religious, or irreligious, mood of our day was never more piquantly expressed than by the late Gamaliel Bradford when he wrote an epitaph for piety entitled "Exit: God":

"Of old our fathers' God was real,
Something they almost saw,
Which kept them to a stern ideal
And scourged them into awe.

"They walked the narrow path of right
Most vigilantly well,
Because they feared eternal might
And boiling depths of hell.

"Now hell has wholly boiled away
And God become a shade.
There is no place for Him to stay
In all the world He made.

"The followers of William James
Still let the Lord exist,
And call Him by imposing names,
A venerable list.

"But nerve and muscle only count,
Gray matter of the brain,
And an astonishing amount
Of inconvenient pain.

"I sometimes wish that God were back
In this dark world and wide
For though some virtues He might lack,
He had His pleasant side."

The artistry of that satire lies, of course, in its understatement. Gamaliel Bradford was speaking to sophisticates in a language which they understand and respect, innuendo and polite ridicule, not too polite. But back of the restraint of it and after the lightning flash of it was a thunderous protest against psychologies which despiritualize men, and theologies which humanize God. If life is to have a continuing meaning, a redeeming

"pleasantness," some universal Power, Justice, Friendliness, of the sort that used to be worshiped as God, must be rediscovered and re-enthroned in experience. To bring a personal God back into "this dark world and wide" is the supreme task of religion, the unique function of ministry. To quote again from Doctor Hough, "What God is in eternity, what Jesus Christ became in time, the Church is to make perpetually commanding in the minds of men." This can be achieved not by drudgery under the lash of duty but only by the radiant energy of a great resolution and a great elation, the sort of gay courage shown by ordained or unordained exponents of God in a world which delights in discrediting Him.

Among these is the truly great Italian savant and litterateur, Benedetto Croce, who diagnosed our times and defined our task in redeeming them when he said in the Philip Maurice Deneke Lecture delivered at Oxford in October, 1933:

"Our civilization is technically perfect and spiritually barbarous; ravenous of wealth and indifferent to good; utterly insensible to all that ought to move the human conscience. All its powers seem employed in selfish aggression or defense. This is the dense atmosphere in which we are stifled, which painfully chokes and crushes every freedom of heart, every delicate sensibility, every quickness of mind. But if some fresh rain of poetry should permeate it, what recreation would it bring, what ampler breath, what heightened spirits! Then we should renew our sense of the eternal human drama, of the tragedies and glories of our kind; we should see things once more in their true proportions and relations, in their harmonious hierarchy; we should fall in love again with love and loving-kindness; we should renew our scorn for all that is base and abject, and vulgar; our hearts would reopen to hope and joy, to manly grief, to the relief of tears, to frank and cleansing laughter—the laughter so seldom heard in a world where it is outfaced by sarcasm, by sly leers, or by shameless ribaldry."

It is almost as if he had said, "Blessed are the debonair; for they shall re-inspire, they shall re-possess, they shall inherit the earth."

Croce sets forth the cause of the current distrust of spirit-forces when he says in the same lecture: "The old religion loses every day more of what respectability it still possessed as a practical institution, by making terms with the powers of this world, and in return for its services, pocketing a bribe or snatching a material advantage."

That statement, couched in ringing measures, the kind of prose-poetry which Croce himself finds redeeming, tolls a tocsin to men intelligent enough to hear its deep-toned warnings. It is an imperious call to a new crusade against religious defeatism, religious apologeticism, and religious syncre-

tism, which have brought the Church into the shallows where it is now floundering.

Croce's "powers of this world," with which religion has supinely "made terms," are easily identified. For years it sold out to Science and prided itself on the alacrity with which it achieved naturalization in a world of neural tensions, radio-activity, and neutral entities. The net result of that transaction was fundamentalism on the one side and agnosticism on the other, each in its intolerance, exile from God. Thanks to thinkers like Croce, this conflict was eventually resolved in liberal evangelicism.

Today the Church in many quarters is "making terms" with politics just as shamelessly, just as tragically as it once compromised with Science. Again and again the argument is advanced that religion did not stop the last war and will not prevent the next one, which is immediately imminent. The Church is charged with a do-nothing policy where industrial or social evils are concerned or is more openly branded "the chloroforming agent of the confiscating classes." Everywhere, and especially in Russia, Mexico, Germany, Italy, and America, the political powers that be are accorded the primacy and reverence which religion once commanded. Clergymen, even, are proud to do most anything in the name of Philosophy, Psychiatry, Sociology, Fascism, Communism, or Nudism, as if wearing no shirt or a particular kind of shirt, red, black, or brown, were going to save the world. They forget that Jesus said, "The body is more than raiment and the spirit than meat and drink"; also that the "very God of very God" whom many of them flout so flamboyantly is the Power which gives all their political nostrums any virtue or value they may have. Despite the success of his anti-Semitic program, Adolf Hitler has found no cure for the ills of the world so efficacious as that of the Hebrew prophet who said: "Not by might, nor by power, but by my spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts."

As long ago as 1923 Ernst Troeltsch, distinguished successor of Schleiermacher and Ritschl as high priest of German Theology, saw the turn that thought was taking and tried to stem the rising tide of nationalism and paganism. With the prophetic insight and vigor of an Amos or an Isaiah, he foresaw National Socialism and tried to scotch it before it had clouded the Christian dream of universal brotherhood.

It was at a time when the Boston University Philosophy Club, acting under the influence of Dr. Edgar S. Brightman and Dr. Albert C. Knudson, had done a debonair thing. Having heard from American students in

Berlin that Professor Troeltsch was in ill-health and straitened circumstances, it sent him a sum of money to help him carry on his work in the field of Philosophy of Religion. I happened to be one of the delegation which delivered this gift, and so can report first-hand Professor Troeltsch's reaction to that experience.

"It is things like this," he said, with gratitude softening his already less fevered eyes, "which will finally bring peace among the nations . . . ideas of friendship and helpfulness. This will make me well again. I am better already. After a little while I can write my book intended to show that back of material and industrial forces are spiritual factors that are finally determinative. Just now the Marxians and the militarists are in the saddle riding rough-shod over the rights of persons. They believe that the destinies of men and of nations are determined by economics or politics. I want to prove that they are wrong and that, in the last analysis, ideas, spirits, are more redeeming than industries or long range guns or even peace pacts. The final factor is spiritual."

Since then Troeltsch's countrymen have had ample opportunity to re-echo his faith and re-live his courage. Karl Barth "followed in his train" magnificently and is now living in exile. Peter Brunner took the same road, at least as far as a Nazi concentration camp.

"No Christian can be either a Nazi or a Communist," he wrote from prison. "This is the heresy of the modern man that he seeks to take captive the Word of God, God's revelation, by means of other so-called 'revelations' which he finds in nature and history, in race and native soil. We could tell for hours about how for the past year and a half attempts have been made to chain and bind the Word of God, and to surrender the Gospel of Jesus to the powers of this world. But whenever I put such secular powers alongside the Word of God, whenever I associate Christ and the Nordic soul, Christ and the nationalistic forces, Christ and racial blood as equal revelations, then actually Christ is bound to the powers of this world and is carried away captive out of our midst, as in Gethsemane."

German Catholics have met the political menace with the same holy boldness. Cardinal Faulhaber has repeatedly risked deportation or death by refusing to follow the dictates of National Socialism. And only a few months ago, when the Hitler cult reached its peak, German pilgrims, just as courageously and more debonairly, marched into Rome, shouting to Italians who greeted them with a Fascist salute: "Heil Christus! Heil

Christus!" With equal gallantry Mexican Christians have died beneath the machine guns of Communists but not until, like Polycarp or Origen, they had made "a good confession": "Viva Christo Rey!" "Long live Christ the King!" As an eye-witness tells the story, the cry was taken up by the crowd until two thousand voices were raised in the hymns of the Church. "They sang like children joyously unafraid, their voices carrying for blocks," above the bark of machine guns and the boom of hand grenades. Doubtless someone said, "It thundered." But others, who still believe in holy voices, must have heard another somewhere: "These are my beloved sons in whom I am well pleased." Blessed are the debonair, for theirs is the Kingdom, the power, not of this world but of Heaven. As Croce suggests, these are times which call for a new crusade which will disentomb God and re-enthroned "Christ the King" on "the high places of the field." They demand the kind of *elan* displayed by another "clan of gallant gentlemen" immortalized in an old legend.

Scottish knights of the Cross were returning from the Holy Land when they suddenly found themselves surrounded by the Infidels. Retreat was cut off on both sides and in the rear. They must move forward if at all. Their leader, who happened to be carrying the ashes of Robert Bruce's heart in a small swinging casket, raised it high above his head and with prodigious strength hurled it into the advancing Saracens, at the same time shouting, "Lead on, O heart of Bruce, and we will follow." Spurred on by loyalty to their leader and his vision of enduring good, the Crusaders made their way through the Infidels, recovered Bruce's heart and carried it back in triumph to his beloved Scotland.

That was centuries ago. But only last summer I saw the same spirit exemplified in flesh and blood and apostolic valor. Let me tell you the story slowly so that you can experience it vividly as I did.

We were in Moscow, capital of the country in which "there is no God." And yet crowds of pilgrims were swarming into Red Square to visit Lenin's Tomb, where his meticulously embalmed body lies in idolatrous state. We joined the pilgrims, passed wordlessly by the strange object of their adoration, and left, a little revolted, but glad to have seen fetish worship as it is practiced in a country where "there is no God."

When I got back to my hotel an Intourist guide was waiting to tell me I could go to church if I wanted to.

"In Moscow?" I said.

"Certainly!" she answered. "In Russia we have freedom of everything, including worship."

"Yes," I said—"I mean, I want to go to church."

We drove out to one of the smaller Greek Catholic Churches where they were having a special Holy Day Service. The nave and wings of the church were crowded with obviously ardent communicants, many of them between eighteen and thirty. As always in a Greek Catholic Church, the music was incomparable. The bishop's face was like Anton Lang's when he played the Christus at Oberammergau and his voice was the most moving I have ever heard, now like the wrath of God outraged by a country which had renounced Him, and again forgivingly tender—"When Israel was a child, then I loved Him."

The service concluded with a strange procession in which the worshipers placed lighted tapers before ikons of the saints and kissed the Cross in the bishop's hand. Somehow the ban on religion in Russia, combined with the "dim religious light," made me remember the catacombs and the apostolic courage of the early Christians.

Perhaps that is what a patriarchal old man read in my eyes as he came down the aisle with the cool comfort of the crucifix still on his lips. He stopped in front of me and smiled benignly, paternally. Then, speaking softly but torrentially, he said something to me in Russian which, of course, I didn't understand. I could only listen reverently and hope he knew that I appreciated where I didn't understand. Suddenly he stopped speaking, made the sign of the Cross on my forehead, and kissed me on either cheek. I felt as if I had received a new and more valid ordination and stood with bowed head as he walked out of the church into the jeers of the street-urchins waiting to twit the Christians.

When he had gone I turned to my Intourist guide, a militant atheist, and said: "Won't you please tell me what he said?"

"Oh," she demurred, "It was all a lot of silly nonsense."

"Perhaps," I admitted, "to you. But he meant it for me and was so terribly earnest about it. You speak elegant English and have an amazing memory. Won't you please translate it for me, word for word, as you remember it?"

The flattery worked.

"Well," she said, "if you must know, he said he was pleased that you were interested in the service and seemed to be impressed by it. He could

tell by your clothes that you were a stranger, perhaps an American. He was glad that you, an outlander, had found that there was still one place in Russia where men worship not a man but God. Silly, isn't it? I don't understand what he means. Do you?"

"Yes," I said, remembering the martyrs, and the old man, and wanting, like them, to witness "with an excellent boldness": "I think I do. You see, I visited Lenin's tomb today."

She flushed understandingly. Then with sudden petulance: "Oh! It's all so hot and stuffy in here. Let's get out as soon as possible."

Maybe it was, for her; but not for me. Sunlight was all around me, except for patches of coolness, the shadow of a great rock in a weary land. I was seeing modern Crusaders, surrounded by the infidels but unafraid. I was hearing them shout down the centuries: "Lead on, O Life of Christ, and we will follow."

Thus does Apostolic valor reappear in modern dress. Thus do our times set the stage for the re-enactment of the age-old drama of crucifixion and darkness over the earth. Foreshadowing its redeeming denouement, the Chorus has already appeared in the persons of gay Believers in Russia, Germany, and Mexico. With the romance and courage of Crusaders they still sing "Fairest Lord Jesus!" In an age of naturalism and pragmatism they stand steadfastly for spiritual values. In an age of mechanism and humanism they dare to speak for souls and God. In an age of sophistication and cynicism they believe in kindliness and peace. They, and all who follow in their train, are marching with the debonair who say: "I am a citizen of the Commonwealth of God in which all men are brothers. I acknowledge no loyalty higher than devotion to its ideals, and find no adventure more alluring than its service. Under its standard, a crucifix, I represent the soul-force of forgiving love, which for two thousand years has dethroned dynasties, and deflated the high-blown pride of demagogues. I've heard of a city called heaven. I've started to make it my home. Lead on, O Vision of a world redeemed, and we will follow!"

The Revolt of Israel's Prophets Against Nationalism in Religion

LEROY WATERMAN

OUR potential debt to Israel is probably more far-reaching and significant than most people are aware. We are accustomed to see its summation in the gift of Christianity to the world. This bequest is of course obvious, but as a statement it leaves out of account some major factors. It needs to be emphasized that Israel had a far richer legacy to make to the world than organized Christianity has ever realized in practice or clearly conceived in theory.

That contribution has its epitome in the prophetic movement that began in the eighth century B. C. and culminated in Jesus of Nazareth. Only a slight fraction of the main recommendations of the prophets was ever adopted and the world since their time has never paid them more than lip service; nevertheless the memory of them has never entirely faded and indirectly their influence is still to be reckoned with. They are among the greatest figures of antiquity, and it is questionable whether any other human group ever uttered such vital truths for the welfare of mankind. I wish to call attention to one main thesis of their teaching, namely, their revolt against a narrow, nationalistic religion.

It is still true in our day that the nation is the largest effective and generally accepted unit for the conduct of human affairs and the conservation of human rights. The League of Nations exists by virtue of national self-interest on the part of those nations that recognize certain major common objectives. Yet great nations refuse to join, or join and then withdraw, when they fail to see those self-interests confirmed and promoted.

Likewise in our day we have seen nationalism attempt to become an end in itself in the totalitarian states such as Russia and Germany, which have assumed their superiority to religion, conscience, and all personal rights. It is sometimes only by a study of the past, and of what has already been accomplished, that we can be assured that certain proposed innovations offered as solutions of current problems not only do not promise a better future but actually indicate a retreat toward an outlived past.

It may be worth our while, therefore, briefly to explore the past in

order to try to discover whether it has anything to offer toward the eradication of those dangers to a healthy nationalism, which Communism, Fascism, and Socialism in our day seek to solve.

Ancient Israel affords an excellent example for our study since it can be traced from the simplest organization of a nomad desert tribe to a settled people in an independent state, which finally came to extinction primarily because of certain principles of nationalism that were held by its people.

In essence Israel, as an independent nation, was always a totalitarian state, first because the problem of the rights of the individual apart from the state had not yet arisen; secondly, loyalty to the national god was always taken for granted, and eventually laws were enacted (see Deuteronomy 17) which made the worship of any other god a capital offense; and thirdly, their basic theory of nationalism was that land, people and god formed a closed corporation against all the rest of the world.

Inside the national borders there were certain common rights and privileges. Outside there were no human rights whatever. The people also believed that they were children of destiny, and that as long as they were loyal to their national god and served him according to immemorial rites and ceremonies, he was bound to protect them, and to help them in the conquest of all their foes. It will be seen that theirs was no very exalted ideal either of religion or politics, and upon closer examination it becomes evident that their conception was not something unique in Israel, rather it furnishes a type pattern to which the nations of antiquity all conform in essentials; while modern nations differ not so much in essential features, as in lack of frankness as to their primary aims and objectives.

Modern states differ also from Israel in that not everyone has a separate state religion with its own national god. But even this distinction is more apparent than real. Those nations that have a state church, for example, do have in effect a separate national religion. In normal times, to be sure, this is scarcely apparent, but if it is doubted, it is only necessary to note that the Christian nations of the world, whenever at war with one another, and this has been all too often, have never felt it to be ridiculous or in any way incongruous to trust in and invoke the aid of their Jehovah against the Jehovah of their opponents. More explicit in modern times is the assumed right of some states to set up their own ideal as a challenge to all existing religion as we see in present-day Russia. Or we may cite the

case of Nazi Germany that today seeks to subordinate all existing forms of Christianity to the New Paganism of the dominant political party.

Such extremes only show the more clearly that nationalism in religion is not only not dead, but that wherever a universal conception of religion has been attained, nationalism inevitably tends to reduce it again to national terms. This results in a very definite tendency from monotheism to practical polytheism in the modern world.

This outcome is in itself serious enough from a cultural standpoint, but more serious still is its inevitable accompaniment of reducing universal ethical truth to the limitations of clan ethics. As a climax to this situation, modern science has placed in the hands of the industrialized nations, physical forces of destruction immeasurably greater than ancient clan ethics ever dreamed of, or were capable of controlling for the common good. It is this vast enlargement of the control of destructive forces, accompanied by a corresponding belittling of moral responsibility, that has brought to modern civilization a sinister undermining threat that if not checked may conceivably result in its complete collapse. This threat is no longer a vague nightmare of dreamers. Today it hangs like a menacing cloud above the horizon of every great nation of the world. It finds its chief outward expression, probably, in the haunting fear of another World War which, in the opinion of some of the ablest minds, western civilization may doubtfully survive.

It will readily be seen that the tap root of the menace to our civilization is to be found not in nationalism per se, but in nationalism in religion, since it is this which discounts moral responsibility and denies human rights beyond the national pale.

It is a striking fact, therefore, that more than 2,700 years ago, a group of men, beginning with the prophet Amos, called attention to this same peril to their nation Israel, and at the same time proceeded to lay down the principles for its elimination. But it is one of those astonishing anomalies of history that, while the truth of their diagnosis of Israel received a perfect demonstration within a generation, in the downfall of the nation, neither politics nor religion, Judaism nor Christianity, from that day to this has ever given any vitally serious consideration to this ancient warning, until today storm warnings are flown from the great chancelleries of the world and a sense of foreboding, not of a merely national but a possible world disaster, marks this harvest of neglect of basic principles.

What was the prophetic challenge to nationalism in religion, and what

does it signify for life today? First of all it is to be emphasized that the prophets never had anything to say against nationalism itself; on the contrary their thought centered in the nation, rather than the individual, as the ideal unit. Secondly, while in modern times threats of national disaster almost always come from without, it was characteristic of the prophets that, although they were keenly alive to outside dangers, their fundamental diagnosis dealt with perils from within the nation itself.

In the third place, their first message did not arise out of a period of depression and discouragement like the recent past but, quite the contrary, it came at a time of great outward prosperity and abounding national self-confidence. To be more exact, it was primarily the interplay of economic forces that called forth the first great prophetic protest. Israel's evolution covered the transition from the desert to the town, and some of her greatest thinkers partook of both types of life. Such men were Elijah, John the Baptist; and the prophet Amos.

Israel had a priceless heritage from the desert in the Bedouin conception of personal dignity and democratic equality, unsurpassed anywhere in the world. The typical Bedouin can scarcely conceive that economic status could make any difference in a person's standing, since in his habitat all economic assets are the common possessions of the clan. Naturally, when the Israelites became settlers and city dwellers in Palestine and eventually owners of property, most of them forgot their desert heritage, and the simple principles of personal worth—most but not all. Chief among those who did not forget the inheritance of freedom and personal dignity were certain great prophetic leaders.

Economic forces in Israel, as elsewhere, ran their usual course. Once stable government was established and trade organized, wealth accumulated. A few became relatively rich or at least well-to-do. The many remained extremely poor. A goodly number of men, women and children fell below the poverty line and were sold into slavery for debt. The rich exploited the poor. They frustrated justice by bribery of the courts. They loaned money and rented land at exorbitant rates. Economic might made right as in our time. By the eighth century B. C. this process had resulted in a small, privileged class, with the masses of the people reduced to penury. Nevertheless business was brisk, trade was good and the well-to-do called it prosperity, and saw in the status quo the evidence of divine favor to the nation.

Not so the prophet Amos. This rugged character was first of all a

shepherd and to this extent associated with the nomad, but he was also a dresser of sycamore trees, who lived on the edge of the desert twelve miles south of Jerusalem. Here he spent most of his days, but it is probable that at least annually he visited the city of Bethel, one of the main religious and business centers of north Israel. Thither he came to dispose of his wool and the increase of his flocks. His usual manner of life thus closely approximated that of the Bedouin, while his need for a market brought him into intimate contact with a typical center of the nation's life. He had a peculiarly favorable vantage point from which to observe the life of his time, as well as ample leisure to ponder over what he had seen.

What was his diagnosis? This man, a devout patriot, saw the glaring inequalities, the gross injustices, the galling oppressions of his people. This man of the far horizons and the deep silences, who could look every man squarely in the eye and whose keen sense of the dignity of personality would not permit him to observe without fiery protest personal wrong or injustice, no matter how well supported by custom, by legal sanction or religious authority, was at first appalled by what he saw.

He believed in his nation and his nation's god. Behind him lay 500 years of Jehovah's kindly providence for Israel. But his conception of the nation was a nation of freemen, where the rights of personality should never be cramped or denied because forsooth some individual had gained control of the physical power to do so. What he saw was the mass of free peasantry, that normally constituted the bulk of the nation, rapidly being liquidated. A few were growing richer, the greater part were in dire poverty. The outcome of such a process if allowed to run its natural course was not difficult to foresee, especially in the case of such a small community as Israel. It could only result in a body of serfs subject to a few overlords who controlled the economic wealth of the country.

Whether we agree with him or not, Amos' conclusion was that such a result would in itself constitute the destruction of the nation. That is to say, a people without freedom, without justice, compelled to serve a pampered few, as a condition of living at all, and reduced to a state of economic servitude may continue to exist, but it cannot become a nation; nor can a nation that falls into that condition long continue to be a nation.

When Amos first attacked the status quo on the ground of justice and human rights he was promptly and sharply met by those in power with the claim that the national religion sanctioned the existing order, and

that it was due to the mercy of God that they enjoyed the current prosperity. This gave the prophet and his successors their first great challenge. Amos accordingly proceeded to make the same searching inquiry into the current official religion that he had made in the economic field. He found, on the whole, that those in authority were very religious. They made generous, even profuse benefactions to religion. They fully believed that God was with them and that they knew how to gain and to keep his favor. They had behind them every official sanction and the prestige of custom and long revered usage, so that they felt themselves to be impregnable.

Thus it came to pass, probably for the first time in history, that the test of the truth of a religion was made to rest on its ability to minister to the welfare of the greatest number. Amos found that the greatest punctiliousness in religion made no difference in the everyday affairs of these people. For religion was a service performed in the sanctuary on special days. It consisted of rites and sacrifices, performed according to sacred custom.

The offerings made and the homage paid were supposed to atone for all sins, appease the divine wrath and assure God's favor to the nation. Amos and his successors saw the nation meanwhile being undermined and ruined from within, in spite of the national religion and even condoned by it.

But the prophets were heroic souls, sound patriots, and first-class thinkers, and they denounced ritualistic religion, all ritualistic religion, which was all the religion Israel had ever had to date, as a snare, a delusion, and a sham. They declared with absolute clearness that if civilization is to be perpetuated it is necessary to have justice between man and man as a primary consideration. Therefore the religion that is blind to injustice, or that condones it, or that fails directly and definitely to promote justice, can be no part of God's will or of his purpose for men.

In place of the existing religious usage, which they thus positively condemned, they proposed to have no holy days, no smoking altars, no vested priests, no special sanctuaries. In fact they sponsored no ritualistic acts whatever, but over against them all Amos has but one recommendation: "Let justice roll down as waters and righteousness as a perennial stream." That is, not in ritualistic acts may men expect to find God or gain His favor; they will find Him in acts of justice and kindness to their fellow men, if they seek Him in that way, but if they fail in these two things they will never find Him at all.

As the climax of this revolt, the prophets declared that the nation's

confidence in its religion was a false reliance, that their leaders were mistaken in supposing that they had Jehovah's favor, or could get it by the customary means. On the contrary they declared that their fostering of injustice was arousing the divine wrath and that unless they repented and speedily changed their ways, God would come and destroy the nation.

Here was a complete break with nationalism in religion. If the prophetic claims were true, nationalistic religion had always been false and never could be true. There was then no such thing as a chosen people, as the special favorite of God and divine destiny. More sweeping still, the principle was laid down that there was no ritualistic means for securing the divine favor by anyone at any time. But most significant and drastic of all, it was declared that the only basis, anywhere, for securing divine help and for assuring national well-being was to be found in doing justice and in practicing kindness in all human affairs.

As for our interest in these matters today, it must be granted that the thesis of the prophets remains theoretical. It has never been positively demonstrated, let alone disproved, because no society of men has ever seriously adopted it. To be sure, Christianity was born as a culmination of the prophetic movement in Israel, but organized religion today for the most part suffers from a twofold handicap. The first is to be seen in the fact that on the whole it has never denied the efficacy of the ritualistic principle, which was an essential part of nationalism in the religion of Israel, and which was condemned by Jesus and the prophets. Secondly, organized religion is largely in bondage to the economic order. The civilized world, including religion, is governed today by the same principles of economics that obtained in ancient Israel of the eighth century B. C. with very slight modification of the rules. The industrial and technical developments of modern times are bringing out ever more clearly the inherent weaknesses and shortcomings of these principles, and they all go to confirm the prophetic diagnosis of Israel so long ago. Justice tempered with mercy, accompanied by a fitting sense of humility in the presence of supreme values, must be realized and satisfied if men are to go on living together. There are without doubt social agencies, and economic organizations that realize the importance of these aims and are striving to reach them, but their effect is entirely incommensurate with the task, for this is more than a social question; it is more than an economic question; it is fundamentally a religious question, that deals with the highest conception of human values.

Very slowly organized religion is awakening to some sense of its responsibility to the prophetic message, of which it is the formal custodian. One can only appeal to the organized religious forces more speedily to cast off their torpor of otherworldliness and refusal of social responsibility, and openly to strive to justify their claim to be a saving factor in our civilization, while the opportunity still exists.

The spirit of the prophets still lives, and their message still challenges our age, at least in the sense that the spiritual-economic crisis of their day, because left unheeded until now, has become the world crisis of our time, and also because we are now proposing to safeguard ourselves against it, from without, by the adoption of the primitive notion of every nation for itself, regardless of injustice, and by offering up enormous and ever-increasing sacrifices to the grim Moloch of high explosives, poison gas, and armor plate, as our one sure hope of salvation. While from within, in the presence of abundance, we are supposed to charm away the insistent demand for bread, the demand of millions in enforced idleness, by stimulating the profit motive and by encouraging a rugged individualism that recognizes no god but the Almighty Dollar.

Ancient Israel at its blindest never cherished such fond illusion, nor did it ever sink to such depths of crass, unreasoning idolatry, while outwardly claiming to be the favored of the Lord. Israel could always prove its faith to be based upon a living historical tradition. But it was to meet a similar misconception that the voice of the Divine spoke these incisive words in the book of Amos: "Are you not as the Ethiopians unto me, O Israelites?" (9. 7.) Had that proposition been grasped and conceded by Israel, nationalism in their religion would have been at an end; and it would be at an end in the Western world today if we could but apprehend our own condition with half the clearness with which we can appraise the plight of ancient Israel.

But that early people, who thus sealed their own fate, were blinded by their preconceived notions, their prejudices, and their short-sighted, unreasoning faith in the status quo. The modern world still suffers from the same handicaps, in scarcely less degree, but with far greater responsibility because of that ancient example and the prophetic warning.

It is no time for complacency or delay, and we may rest assured that if we temporize or hesitate too long the fate that befell Israel may overtake our civilization, with only ourselves to thank.

Unfinished Business

CHARLES E. SCHOFIELD

IN the popular debate that has been growing more and more heated in Western society over the nature of the economic and political structure of that society, there is a good deal of "unfinished business." We are being pressed insistently for action of a radical, not to say revolutionary character. We do not here wish to argue whether such revolutionary action should or should not ultimately be taken. We simply call the attention of the chair to some of the items of "unfinished business" that are on the agenda of the public opinion of the Western world. We would only insist that these items need to be completed, or at least dealt with far more adequately than we have yet dealt with them, before we are ready to call "the previous question."

I

It was inevitable that the major debate of our generation should turn upon the question of the economic and political structure of Western society. Since the beginning of the industrial revolution—with its application of power machinery to the processes of production; with its feverish search throughout the earth for new sources of raw materials; with its intense competition for markets for the rapidly multiplying products of the economic process; with its struggles for colonial and economic empire—the attention of Western society has been focused increasingly upon economic problems. We have made achievement in this field the measure of successful living. We have sought to satisfy all the demands of life with the fruits of the economic process. The prevailing secularism, our modern substitute for religion, depends for its success as a philosophy and discipline of life upon the possibility that all of the demands of living can adequately be met through absorption in economic achievement.

Our troubles have come upon us because the glowing hopes with which we have thrown ourselves into economic adventure have disappointed us at many points. We have multiplied the productivity of human labor beyond the dreams of any earlier generation. We have substantially lifted the standards of living of the masses. But we have increased their wants even more than we have enabled them to gratify their desires.

Another fact with which we need to reckon is the increasing influence of the economic philosophy of Karl Marx. Karl Marx was one of those exceedingly disagreeable individuals who insist upon having ideas. And ideas, whether they be true or false, are always centers of disturbance. Emerson long ago remarked that "when God lets loose a thinker on this planet all things are at risk." We are just beginning to realize in our day how terrible a disturber Karl Marx may yet prove to be. One thing should be clear. Whenever we undertake to meet a disagreeable or unwelcome idea with repressive force we only step up its power to disturb and unsettle. We shall never get anywhere by refusing to answer the summons when Karl Marx is knocking at the door. We shall have to reckon with him whether we will or not. We had better invite him in to the discussion. Then, in the light of a critical analysis of the whole situation, in the atmosphere of untrammelled debate, with open minds, we can search for the premises upon which to build an adequate economic philosophy for our modern industrial society.

Ever since Karl Marx published the *Communist Manifesto* in 1847 his disciples have maintained a running fire of criticism leveled at the major premises of modern industrial society. Since the War the volume of this criticism has steadily increased. The Russian Revolution and the successful establishment of a government that avows its allegiance to Marxian philosophy has given dramatic illustration and world-wide publicity to the philosophy and program of radical socialism. Particularly noteworthy is the extent to which this radical criticism of the established order has found expression in such thoughtful journals of opinion in America as *The Forum*, *Scribners*, *Harpers*, and even *The Atlantic Monthly*. A considerable number of more or less permanent periodicals like *The Nation*, *The New Republic*, and *The Survey*, have become quite whole-hearted advocates of a radical reconstruction of the economic pattern of Western society.

Perhaps the most significant thing about this whole trend has been the degree to which educators and religious leaders have become spokesmen of social protest and advocates of radical economic reconstruction. Ever since the middle of the last century a small minority among the clergy have been outspoken advocates of more or less revolutionary proposals. Walter Rauschenbusch, through his long term of service in Rochester Seminary, provided for dissatisfied spirits in the Church through the last generation, a prophetic voice which awakened an increasing volume of echoes.

The World War had a tendency for a time to shunt the latent idealism of those who were most susceptible to the appeal of a social Christianity into other channels. With the collapse of the stock market in 1929 and the plunge into the depths of economic despair which followed, the debate over social issues was resumed with increased bitterness and determination. Such men as Harry F. Ward, from his highly strategic position on the faculty of Union Theological Seminary, have been preaching a doctrine that practically accepts the full communist position—saving only its bitter and determined animus against all religion. Such men as Sherwood Eddy and Kirby Page, through both platform and pen, have won a wide hearing and an immense influence over the students who have crowded into the colleges during the post-war years. Norman Thomas, as the standard-bearer of the American Socialist Party, won the support of large numbers of the younger clergy. A series of questionnaires, circulated largely among clergymen, and dealing with questions relating to the acceptance or rejection of war and the approval or disapproval of capitalism, have revealed a strong tendency, especially among the younger men, toward increasing sympathy with the economic and political philosophy of radical socialism.

Altogether there has developed what approaches an orthodoxy of social radicalism. The term "capitalism" is coming to take on, in the common usage of this group, much of the same connotation traditionally associated with the idea of "sin." "The profit motive" has come to stand as the symbol of spiritual uncleanness. "A collective" or "a co-operative society" has become synonymous with "The kingdom of God." These phrases are commonly used as though the goal of Marxian philosophy were a sufficient blueprint for the construction of an ideal society. With what approximates apocalyptic fervor we are exhorted that "the time is short," "revolution is at the doors." Christians must come out of the Babylon of capitalism or the Church is certain to be overwhelmed in the collapse of capitalistic society. With the passionate intensity of evangelists, churchmen are implored to set about the reorienting of the total program of the Church in terms of revolutionary "social action." We hear men speaking of varying degrees of "advance" in thinking in a way that assumes that the nearer a man's social theories are to the position of Marxian philosophy, the nearer to ultimate truth he has come. Liberals are patronized, pitied and branded as obviously men either of tragically limited mental caliber or fearfully stubborn souls. One of the contributors to the symposium, *The Younger*

Churchmen Look at the Church (Macmillan, 1935), insists that "to assist in the creation of a government that will make this revolutionary transformation of our economic order should be the main task of the Church today."

II

But here we would rise to a point of order. There are a few questions that must be reckoned with before we are ready for the final vote.

To begin with, it would help greatly to clarify the discussion if churchmen would recognize candidly the sources of their ideas. In the interests of sheer honesty and of clear thinking, we ought to recognize the degree to which the propaganda of social revolt of our day bears the stamp of the ideology of Karl Marx. The whole pattern of social revolution which finds expression in such concepts as "the class struggle," "the capitalist class," "the proletariat," "the profit motive," "wage slavery," "the general strike," "sabotage," "a classless society," et cetera, is derived neither from the Old nor the New Testaments, nor from any possible reconstruction of the eighth-century prophets nor of first-century Christianity. It is derived directly from the philosophy of Karl Marx.

When we thus trace certain ideas back to Karl Marx that does not mean that they must summarily be thrown out of court. Karl Marx is a man with whose ideas the world will have to reckon for a long time to come. It may be that, no matter with what reluctance, nor by way of no matter how much violent conflict, ultimately we shall have to accept many or most of his conclusions. It may be that the Christianity of the next hundred years or more will eventually prove to be an amalgam of the Hebrew-Christian tradition we have inherited from the past, with the interpretation and development of the philosophy of Karl Marx which the controversy and conflict of the next half century will produce. We are simply urging that before we hasten to irrevocable decisions we need to turn upon the Marxian philosophy the same searching criticism to which we have been trying to subject our traditional economic and political practices and ideals.

One of the points upon which we need to focus our criticism is the Marxian philosophy of history. It is axiomatic in Marxian circles that social evolution must inexorably pass through a definite and inescapable series of stages. Out of primitive craftsmanship must emerge capitalistic enterprise. Capitalism will promote industrial expansion through the increased application of power machinery, the improvement of technical

skills and tools, and a concentration of wealth and economic power. This leads inevitably to the progressive impoverishment and disinheritation of the masses and a growing spirit of bitterness and revolt. The ruthless competition which is inherent in capitalism leads through a struggle for raw materials and markets to international friction and a series of wars of increasing magnitude. Ultimately capitalism reaches the limits of possible expansion and its disintegration is swift and inevitable. At some point in the later stages of the process a compactly organized and determined revolutionary party will seize control of government, overthrow the economic overlords of capitalistic society and set up a dictatorship of the proletariat. Under the tutelage of this dictatorship society will gradually eliminate all the bourgeois capitalistic elements, the State, which has been the instrument whereby the exploiters held the masses in subjection, will "wither away," and the paradise of a "classless society" will emerge.

This, essentially, is the pattern of events that lies in the background of the thinking of all who accept Karl Marx's philosophy. One is constantly struck with the apocalyptic fervor and confidence with which social radicals predict the collapse of capitalism, the overthrow of existing governments and legal systems, and the establishment of a dictatorship of the proletariat. Yet it is obvious that apocalyptic prophecies, whether phrased in Hebrew-Christian verbiage or in the vocabulary of Marxian philosophy, have unfailingly proved to be singularly inept as forecasts of actual events.

So obviously did the progress of the actual revolution in Russia contradict the Marxian theory that Lenin was constrained to offer as a modification of the orthodox faith the emended dogma that it might be possible at times to short-circuit the process and arrive at the ultimate goal without having passed through all of the intermediate stages. This, in effect, amounts to a confession that the theory cannot be made to square with the facts. The inescapable implications of Lenin's redaction of the Marxian text have never been honestly faced by our contemporary social radicals.

Anyone who insists that conditions in the United States are so similar to conditions that obtained in pre-revolutionary Russia that the sequence of events in Russia may serve as a forecast of what we may expect in America, is either hopelessly ignorant or is so infatuated with his own fancies that he is unable to observe to any purpose what goes on around him. The Russian Revolution was the product of a combination of bureaucratic inefficiency and administrative incompetence with mass illiteracy and retarded

cultural development that would be difficult to parallel anywhere else in history. Coupled with this was a singularly unintelligent policy of violent repression of dissent directed particularly at the university centers—the only points at which intelligent creative social leadership might be expected to emerge. Add to this a war in which the bureaucratic inefficiency and administrative incompetence produced an appalling loss of life and a growing sense of the utter futility of the whole enterprise. At the outbreak of the revolution the masses of the Russian population were characterized by an immense war-weariness combined with a terrible hunger for land and a blind elemental revolt against everything associated with the old Czarist government. Into this unique situation came a little group of determined revolutionists intent upon one purpose, to seize control of government and consolidate power in their own hands. They were determined, fanatical in their devotion to the somewhat narrow range of ideas comprised in their revolutionary philosophy, and absolutely ruthless in carrying out their purposes. In the whole chaotic Russian situation, Lenin and his associates were the one group that knew exactly what they wanted to do and were determined, at no matter what cost, to do it.

It should be obvious to anyone who thinks at all clearly that there is no evidence that the situation in the United States, or in Western Europe, for that matter, is in any wise parallel, or that there is any prospect of such a successful violent overthrow of established government as destroyed the empire of the Romanoffs. It is utter folly to insist upon trying to formulate a program of action upon an expectation of such a sequence of events. It is high time for social radicals, of all persons, to quit acting like naïve sentimentalists and face the realities of the actual situation. The real alternatives which we face for government in Western Europe and America today are, either a continuance of some form of liberal democracy with the possibility of a progressive development in the direction of increasing social control over economic processes through constitutional means, or the substitution for democracy of some form of Fascist dictatorship.

There is one other item in the Marxian philosophy of history with which social radicals have never reckoned. According to the theory, no group once possessed of power and privilege ever surrenders its prerogatives willingly. Therefore the revolutionary party must pursue their goal with ruthless violence. The Marxian theory moves forward with precision and definiteness of detail until the dictatorship of the revolutionary party is estab-

lished. Then the forecast begins to lose itself in misty hopes. There is nothing in the whole Marxian scheme to give us any encouragement to expect that the revolutionary party, once it has consolidated its autocratic control, will with any greater willingness relinquish that power than did the old economic overlords they overthrew. Certainly the progress of events in Russia has not given us any evidence that the habits and characteristics of dictatorship are any different when it wears the livery of Communism than when it is dressed in the uniform of individualistic enterprise.

III

Apart from our quarrel with the Marxian philosophy of history, we need to call a halt in the demand for immediate action until we have clarified some of the terms with which the debate has been badly muddled. To begin with, just what do we mean by "capitalism" and just what do we mean by "overthrowing the capitalistic system"?

At least two elements must be included in any reckoning with this term. For one thing, it refers to the way in which the industrial process has withheld from the laborers a substantial portion of the product of their toil in the form of large accumulations of surplus capital. Social radicals allege that the laborer is robbed, through the "wage system" and through the whole structure of profits, rent, and interest, of this substantial surplus which rightfully belongs to him. This raises at once the question whether we can maintain the processes of production and distribution upon the basis of the immediate consumption of the total product of the labor of each workday as it passes. We must reckon with the problem of how we shall maintain processes that are not immediately economically productive. Such processes as laboratory experiment and invention, plant expansion and improvement of the machinery of production. If we are to reserve a portion of the production of today in the form of "surplus capital" for use tomorrow, we must reckon with the question of how this surplus is to be conserved. The only method that has yet been devised for the conservation of large capital surplus has taken the form of loans and credits based upon hypothesized future production. As yet no effective substitute for this, which constitutes the essence of capitalism, has been proposed.

The spearhead of the attack upon capitalism today is directed at the private ownership of the instruments of production. The argument begins with such public utilities as water supply, light and power, telephone and

telegraph, radio, and the railroads. Next in importance come such basic raw materials as coal and oil, the basic minerals and the forests. Then the major manufacturing processes. Beyond that lies the question of the ownership of land, and of personal property of every description.

Just what do we mean when we say that we are out to overthrow the capitalistic system? How far do we propose to go? For the individuals of this immediate generation, the members of our churches, the young people in our schools and colleges, in our Sunday schools and young people's societies, to whom we have been appealing to dedicate themselves to the overthrow of capitalism, just what will this mean? What will it mean translated into terms of the administration of their personal affairs? Does this mean, for instance, that we must forswear savings accounts and all forms of insurance? No phase of modern life is so thoroughly capitalistic in principle and practice as is the operation of our insurance companies. Does renouncing capitalism mean that we must liquidate all of the endowments of colleges, hospitals, laboratories and similarly economically non-productive institutions of public service?

Social radicals have never faced the question of how we can maintain those agencies of radical criticism and social dissent that are indispensable to all intellectual as well as practical progress under a system in which all wealth is completely socialized. So far the only alternative that has been proposed to the present plan, whereby such institutions are maintained by private contributions and as various forms of private enterprise and which exercise in their administration all of the rights of persons in the use of private property, is that they should be supported out of the common funds of the community. This means, inevitably, that the newspapers, the radio, moving pictures, public forums, the educational enterprise, and the institutions of religion must become essentially bureaus of the State. And this means that the institutions upon which we must depend for any drastic criticism of the policies of public administration must depend for their existence upon the favor of the officials whom they are set to criticize and whose policies they should call in question. The character of the newspapers of Russia, or Germany, or Italy today, and the kind of program which is proposed for the German Christian Church, show us what that must mean.

The inescapable logic of any complete socialization of all wealth and property is some form of "Totalitarian State," the ruthless suppression of all serious criticism of public policies, and the complete regimentation of

ideas as well as of social and economic practices by the ruling group. We need, in all candor, to face the question whether we are ready to accept such an outcome. Those of us who have been reared in the liberal tradition and who have become accustomed to consider the value of the individual person as among the paramount values of life will have to reckon with the question whether we are ready to accept any such complete submergence of the individual in the mass as is contemplated in Marxian philosophy and as has been demonstrated in the practice of the disciples of Karl Marx in the Russian experiment.

Another question that has not been adequately considered is the problem of the development of character adequate to discharge the kind of social responsibility which the successful operation of a completely socialized society would require. It must be clear to anyone who will think the matter through that, no matter what may be the decision on the abstract question of ownership, some individuals will always actually possess and exercise greater power over their neighbors than others do. Suppose that we accept the Marxian proposal. Suppose all private property is done away. Suppose we abolish all wages and salaries and all dividends and rent and profits and interest. Suppose we set out to put into practice the principle, "From each according to his ability; to each according to his needs." It will still be true that a few men, a comparative minority, will have the power to determine both the conditions under which the mass of their neighbors must live, and the share in the goods out of the common store which each shall receive and enjoy. Someone will have to administer the enterprise. Someone will have to decide what goods and in what quantities the community must produce. Someone will have to decide where each man shall work and how much work each shall do. Someone will have to decide what goods and in what quantities each one shall receive out of the common store. Someone must say "No!" when our wants are greater than the needs the community can recognize. The question of the character of the men and women who exercise authority remains the crucial question for society.

We may make full allowance for the part that environmental conditions play in conditioning character. We do not overlook the fact that the Marxian theoreticians have given a good deal of thought to the problem of education. But too often social radicals have seemed to assume that once the economic pattern is changed character adequate to administer the new pattern will automatically emerge. The Marxian system may eliminate

most of the opportunities for the expression of greed that capitalism seems to encourage. But the Marxian program has never begun to reckon with the lust of men for power and domination. This impulse has proved to be as fruitful a source of evil as has ever the "profit motive." The one point we would raise here is that simply changing the outlines of the economic pattern, will not in itself solve our problem.

One final question we must face. That concerns the spirit in which the discussion shall go forward. The Marxian philosophy leaves us in no doubt upon this point. It is war to the knife and no quarter. There are no ethics to be observed except the one principle that whatever aids in the seizure of power by the revolutionary party becomes the supreme moral obligation. At every point of contact between the classes there must be maintained a bitter and relentless enmity. The whole atmosphere in which radical social controversy goes forward is the atmosphere of war and violence. To a very disturbing extent this same spirit has come to characterize the statements of social radicals within the Christian Church.

It is at this point that the Christian elements in Western society might make a signal contribution. They might set themselves to create a new atmosphere in which the debate can be carried through. The atmosphere of hate, of deceit, of propaganda without regard for truth, of fear, of ruthless violence and irreconcilable conflict, is a poisonous atmosphere in which all that is finest and best in the human spirit dies and all that survives are the malignant cancerous growths that destroy the social organism. Until we can create a new atmosphere of mutual understanding, of co-operation, of corporate thinking and of loyalty to a common social bond in which all the divisive interests of our present anarchic society are resolved, we cannot hope for much genuine social progress.

There can be no resolution of the conflict until he who is called "Socialist" or "Communist" and he who is called "Capitalist" are ready to sit down together and sincerely seek a basis upon which together they may work out a solution of their mutual problems. It is the peculiar task of the Christian Church to create the basis of an inclusive fellowship in which, in genuine mutual understanding and co-operation, in common loyalty to a common Lord, men may seek together whatever reconstruction of their personal attitudes and social practices may be necessary to enable all to share in the achievement of the supreme individual and social values of life.

Modern Theological Education

F. J. FOAKES JACKSON

AFTER the death of good Queen Anne, England was suffering from an intellectual frost. Her soil ceased to produce men of genius, and brilliancy made room for the commonplace. Nowhere was this more conspicuous than in the two great universities of Oxford and Cambridge. The poet Gray was not far wrong in describing the colleges of Cambridge in the words of the Hebrew prophet when he spoke of the houses of ruined Babylon as "full of doleful creatures." Hardly a single professor in the reigns of George I and II made any serious contribution to learning, while as regards piety the university appears to have been, to put it mildly, somnolent. The only consolation a Cambridge man who studies the period can discover is that if the condition of his alma mater was bad, that of the sister university was if possible worse. The known Toryism of the Oxford men had alienated the favor of the crown and the party in power, and the college fellowships were more largely restricted to counties, towns, and schools even than those of Cambridge, to the great disadvantage of their teaching staffs. As the Anglican clergy was almost entirely recruited from these two universities, it is scarcely to be wondered at that the clerical life of the day was at a very low ebb.

At present the demand is for ministers who are called upon to possess a perfectly staggering amount of gifts to qualify them for their duties. No congregation is content with demanding of its pastor all that it is legitimate to require of him: piety, zeal, a blameless life, a practical knowledge of Holy Scripture, a power of exposition to ordinary people, and much else. This alone is enough to make any candidate for the ministry tremble.

But in addition to this, the modern clergyman is not considered to be fully equipped for his life work unless he has been instructed in an immense variety of other subjects. He must be fully abreast of the thought of his age. He ought to know what is being done in the fields of sociology, biology, physiology, psychology; to have received instruction in the principles of law and finance, and of course to have mastered the science of education and to have learned the problems of leadership and how to meet

them. All this and much more has to be presented to the bold aspirant for the modern Christian ministry.

What, it may be asked, can all this possibly have to do with the decadence of Oxford University in Hanoverian days? The answer is that it produced an ordained clergyman who in his own person satisfied almost every requirement of the most up-to-date educationalist. It is unnecessary here to remind anyone that he possessed the qualities everyone hopes to see in a clergyman, deep piety, burning zeal, convincing eloquence, and abundant love for God and man, but displayed in his own life all that the most diffusive modern system of training could afford. No one could possibly deny that he was thoroughly modern in being in touch with the best thought of his age, that he possessed a passion for social reform, had his own views of a well-thought-out system of education, was gifted with a remarkable insight into the springs of human action, though he made no profession of being a psychologist. He was not deficient in legal knowledge, and as for the problem of leadership, no man displayed a greater power of organization and of discipline. He was an excellent linguist and had traveled far. He even gave his followers sensible medical advice. He was a man of his own time, yet far in advance of it, and was known as The Rev. John Wesley, Fellow of Lincoln College. It is not in place here to speak of Wesley as a saint and a genius, but only as an Oxonian. His grandfather, father, and two brothers were all men of mark in the same university; and John held his fellowship at Lincoln for many years and from 1729-1735 punctiliously discharged the duty of a college tutor. It is hardly an exaggeration to say that all his life he continued to be an Oxford "don," exhibiting in his person both the merits and peculiarities of a university man. The question here is what he owed to his education. He certainly did not acquire all he knew at Oxford; but he must have profited greatly by his long sojourn there and undoubtedly entered upon active life as a highly educated man. This goes to prove that the defects of university education in England in the eighteenth century have probably been grossly exaggerated, and that able young men, like those of the Wesley family, had no lack of opportunity to improve their minds during their stay at Oxford. The logical discipline of the schools had throughout his long life a salutary effect on the orderly mind of John Wesley, who had performed his duty as a college tutor with his usual conscientiousness.

The popular belief at present is that anything can and ought to be

taught in our schools and colleges. The abuse of this is seen in students relying too much on their instructors and too little on their own initiative, whereas they often learn more from their friends and contemporaries than from their seniors. The religious friends and associates of the Wesleys were for the most part drawn from the best men in Oxford, from whatever standpoint they are judged. Indeed, a first-rate man in a university, if left alone, educates himself. The pressing educational problem of today seems to be how to decide where the student needs guidance, and where he should be allowed to work out his own intellectual salvation, learning by experience rather than by precept.

The writer of this paper having retired from active life as a teacher, has recently been taking stock of the results of his work with his honor pupils in Jesus College, Cambridge, as their instructor from the time he entered the college in 1882 to his retirement in 1916. The majority of these were graduates who had taken at least a second class in some honor examination for the B.A. degree. He has consequently been chiefly engaged in what here would be called postgraduate work. He has had, therefore, exceptionally good material to deal with; and it is no cause for surprise to him that out of one hundred and fifty-four who obtained first classes in theology in the entire University of Cambridge he had a share in preparing twenty-four. This led him to ask himself how many of these, despite many flattering expressions of gratitude, really had profited by his instruction, and he had to own candidly very few. The success of most was due to native ability and the general atmosphere of the place. This conclusion is justified by the number of valuable books produced by his pupils long after they had ceased to come under his influence. If he had any merit as a teacher it was by knowing when to let good students alone.

These remarks on theological education apply equally to every branch of learning and science, as they deal with the vital question as to how a "scholar" should be defined. Every attempt to do this must necessarily be incomplete; and it is with a humble realization of this that the following endeavor to define the word "scholar" is made.

A true scholar ought to "know himself," that is, to be aware not only of his powers but of his limitations as well. He must also have made up his mind as to what he wants to learn and what he can safely ignore or neglect, and have discovered that it is impossible to be a master of every subject. The true scholar knows not only something well, but is ready to

admit that there are things of which he has no competent knowledge; and not only so, but he understands that the further he has advanced the more there is to be learned. Thus scholarship, not in any narrow or restricted sense, but as embracing all sorts of sound education, means thoroughness, accuracy, and besides, that modesty which must result from honest self-examination: consequently to instill a spirit of scholarship must be the aim of all educators.

In one respect the educational theorists of today are in agreement with inexperienced but ambitious youths, the one desiring to have their students taught everything, while the other expects to be able to master the whole field of learning. In his *Idea of a University* Cardinal Newman has an entertaining description of two imaginary *viva voce* examinations, the first of a well informed lad who has read all about the classics, and the second of a student who has a real knowledge of the two languages. The skill with which the examiner elicited, by dwelling on the one word "*Anabasis*," that the widely read candidate was ignorant of grammar, history, geography et cetera, is inimitable, as it demonstrates once and for all what scholarship means as contrasted with the slovenly reading which can sometimes delude the student, and even his friends, into thinking that he is an educated man.

In the matter of the education of a theologian, scholarship is naturally an important consideration; but it is in danger of being regarded as secondary alike by students and also by those who prescribe their studies. It is true that most of the suggestions are desirable, but at the same time they are impossible if they interfere with necessary discipline of the mind. How much this is needed by an efficient Christian pastor may be explained by a few concrete examples.

Nowadays the most part of every congregation considers itself to be educated, and assuredly a certain kind of knowledge is widely diffused. Yet how few people have any more real knowledge of what they have heard and read than the unfortunate boy whom Newman examined had of the classics. He had devoured many books and learned nothing. This is precisely the condition of most people today. They have been told a great deal and actually hardly understand anything about the information they have received. Yet they think themselves intelligent and believe they live in an age of enlightenment. Nearly all of them have religious difficulties about which a few consult their minister or their friends, but most keep

these to themselves. Then people wonder at the decay of religion and lament the desertion of the churches, especially by men and women of intellect. Yet the greater part of these difficulties are, when examined, the result less of intelligence than of ignorance. Say people are perplexed by the inability of the Church to remove the injustices of the social order. They have never considered to what these are due, for they know nothing of human history or of economic law. They feel that something ought to be done and that the blame must be placed somewhere and generally they jump to the conclusion that the fault lies with the Christian religion. It is not difficult to denounce the present state of affairs, and this is often done with much eloquence in the pulpit; whereas what is needed is to tell of the remedy rather than the disease. This requires hard thinking rather than frothy eloquence, and only one who has been taught how to think can attempt to solve the problem of showing how the application of Christian principles can cure this present distress.

Even more pressing is the trouble caused among very average men and women, namely, what may be called the "new morality." They have a vague notion that the old accepted Christian standards are out of date and they question whether they ought to be continued to be observed, or are even possible under present conditions. Here the minister is confronted with the difficult task of explaining to perturbed souls the meaning of the ethics of the Master, how to apply them, and why they are indispensable.

A third cause of mental disturbance due greatly to the same well-informed ignorance, which appears to cause more terror to wavering Christians, is the advance of modern science. SCIENCE appears, especially to those who know nothing about it, as a sort of omnipotent bogey to scare them away from all religion, and is far less formidable to those who know what it means than to those who have hardly a conception of its nature. A great scientist may profess a modest agnosticism, but very rarely blatant atheism; for he is aware that it has not solved all the mystery of the universe. Every trained minister ought to know this, but it requires a disciplined intellect to explain it to the doubters of his flock. If not versed in scientific work, he can at least point out the fallacy of many of the arguments an inquiring member of his flock may advance.

One of the dangerous symptoms of the day is an insistent demand that the candidates for the Christian ministry, instead of being disciplined by learning a few things thoroughly, should be mentally nourished on books

which can be read without effort, lectures which provide topics for conversation rather than food for thought, and instruction on the technique of pulpit delivery. Whereas, even if he is no more than abreast with the average intelligence of his people, he ought to have more special knowledge than the rest on some points of importance to religion on which the general mind is extraordinarily vague.

In this paper no attempt will be made to construct a "curriculum." Schemes of education like the numerous contributions in Carlyle's *French Revolution* rarely if ever, to use his own word, "march." A distinction, however, may be drawn between the "educator" with views as to the methods which should be employed and what ideal system should be adopted, and the practical teacher who has to consider the actual needs of those who come to him for instruction. The writer, after an experience in more than one university and country, has no theory of his own; but he holds the belief that, to make anything of a pupil, he must have had some sound educational foundation, or acquire one when he begins his studies.

Most successful theologians begin after having acquired a scholarly knowledge of some other subject. In England, and especially at Oxford and Cambridge, the best men who apply themselves to theology have as a rule been previously distinguished in the Greek and Latin classics, but if he can secure a good mathematician to his class, the teacher may congratulate himself, as logical powers are fairly sure to have been developed.

As the writer had not the privilege of preparing anyone trained in a laboratory, he cannot say more than that intercourse with several has convinced him that they would prove most promising material. The study of history, as it is pursued seriously in both universities, is an excellent preparation. The sum of all this is: given a man that has had to learn anything thoroughly, and he can be welcomed with confidence in a theological school.

There is one foundation on which all theology must be built. It may even be possible to imagine a condition of things in which less stress is laid upon the ancient languages in which the Scriptures appeared; but a theological training without great stress on the knowledge of the Old and New Testament is unthinkable. Yet there have been times in which the Bible has been allowed to fall into the background; and there is now a tendency in the direction of subordinating biblical study to that of what is considered more practical.

An attempt to show the supreme importance of the necessity of placing the Bible in the forefront of any sort of theological study, may justly be regarded as superfluous; but a few remarks on the method of teaching students may not be out of place, and the writer ventures to relate two personal experiences of a somewhat different character.

A young man who had devoted two years of his course at Cambridge to historical study asked for supervision in preparing for the Theological Tripos. Had he chosen the historical section, as he was at liberty to do, the task of directing him would have been comparatively simple. Instead of this he resolved to specialize on the New Testament. For this it might reasonably be expected that the candidate should have possessed at least a competent knowledge of Greek before he could hope in less than two years to be given honors in the subject. It appeared that all the Greek the youth had acquired was the minimum demanded to pass the Previous Examination in elementary grammar, a set classical book and a gospel—in this instance that according to Saint Mark. The difficult problem of directing such a man's studies was tackled thus. In the first place it appeared necessary to begin with a survey of the whole Testament, and to induce the candidate to summarize each separate book by himself, not allowing him to use those analyses made by the commentators. When a book was finished he was encouraged to see how this had been done by the best scholars, and where a knowledge of the original would have enabled him to correct his attempts. He had next to compare the Authorized (King James Version) with other English translations, ancient and modern, and account for the variations. All this required both intelligence and hard work from the pupil; and after such preparatory discipline he won a place in the second class, no mean performance considering his antecedents and equal to that of some more than respectable classical scholars, who had taken the Theological Tripos. So much then can be done by a man who is not work-shy, if guided by a teacher bent on instruction rather than on entertainment.

Another example may be taken from the writer's experience. He had, with his colleagues, to examine a thesis for a doctorate. The subject was the respective merits of an English and a German scholar on the origin of the book of Deuteronomy. The candidate was not ignorant; he knew both Hebrew and German and his essay was not at all bad. He failed only when an examiner, less up-to-date than his colleagues, asked some questions as to the contents of Deuteronomy; the moral of which seems to be that

the necessary preliminary of all theological study is a comprehensive knowledge of the Scriptures. This is of far greater value than learning at too early a stage to have a glib knowledge of all those sciences and pseudo-sciences; which makes the student fancy he is abreast with the modern mind, and, moreover, requires a severe discipline to acquire.

It may be not unprofitable to try what might be gained by such a study of the Bible as has been indicated. No better introduction to the English language could be found than the many versions from Wyclif and onward, with the rich and various vocabulary and poetic prose employed by almost every translator. If only the student could be induced to construct from one historical book, say 2 Kings, the story of Israel, supplemented by the contemporary prophecies, and do the work for himself, he would acquire as much insight into historic method as he could from any number of lectures on this difficult subject. A man interested in scientific pursuits can approach the miraculous stories, not with supercilious contempt at the ignorance of the narrators, but with an understanding of phenomena witnessed and described by honest observers. There is indeed hardly any branch of knowledge in which one has been trained, which cannot be supplemented from this marvelous repertoire of man's experience. Entirely apart therefore from its deep religious significance the Hebrew scripture provides inexhaustible treasure, and no apology is needed to insist on its study by all and particularly by those preparing for the Christian ministry.

Next in importance to the study of the Scriptures is that of the first days of the Christian Church and before, for before two or at most three centuries had elapsed, nearly every important moral problem had made its appearance in some form or other, and a lecturer has consequently legitimate reasons for indicating the practical value today of almost everything he discusses in his class. He may invite them to consider how in the very complicated society of the Roman Empire, with the heterogeneous elements of its population, the faith in Christ developed with such rapidity and success. He may call their attention to the rise of the Christian community and show how the Church managed to call into being a body with so much authority combined with a popular and even democratic constitution. Those who are interested in social questions can learn much from the way in which the Church faced the pressing problem of slavery, a condition in some respects not unlike that of labor today. The story of the persecutions is being repeated in countries impatient of the interference with the ideals of

government in a totalitarian state by Christians and Jews. As for those ecclesiastical disputes which occupy so large and dreary a space in most church histories, when carefully considered they are found to bear more resemblance to much of the trend of modern thought than a superficial reader might suspect. The sex problem, which so greatly perplexes people at present, the early church endeavored to meet and solve; and if it made mistakes, they were not much more foolish than most modern attempts. It is hardly too much to say that the history of early Christianity, if intelligently interpreted, can be made alike interesting and practical.

The foregoing is an attempt to show how much useful instruction can be given while the foundations of a sound theological education are being laid. The writer would be the last to disparage or minimize the importance of many of the subjects insisted on by those who devise a curriculum for the ministers of the Church of the future. But he is acutely sensible of the danger of Christian colleges or seminaries turning out men who have been taught so many things which they can learn by the experience of active life, that they had had not time to be grounded in the basic principles of their religion. Uneducated men and women may play a useful part in the maintenance and propagation of the Faith—zeal may do more for this than knowledge, and the simple and childlike minds may have revelations which God has withheld from the wise and prudent. The danger comes from those who having learned a little of everything badly, and nothing well, believe themselves to be highly educated, and arrogate to themselves an authority which they have no right to claim.

What is essential to be borne in mind is the necessary brief period that can be allowed for preparing for a life of pastoral activity; and to determine what it is absolutely necessary to learn at the outset of this training—dabbling in a multitude of detached subjects may result in producing what Bacon calls "ready men," or "full men," but to give anyone a real education, the pupil must be made to concentrate himself in a limited field and to realize both his possibilities and limitations before he can become in the words of that great philosopher "a sound man."

Civilization Is for Man

MELVIN C. HUNT

THE story of man will never be known. When this naked, skulking creature of the jungle first stood upright and saw the stars; when he first organized his cries and calls into a language; when he learned the simple uses of fire, and grew bold enough to conscript a few animals for his own use, must remain hidden in primordial mist. Trivial relics dug out of the dust-heaps of antiquity suggest some pictures of this upward-striving animal. Twentieth-century survivals of unconquered urges and inner trends may give hints of some of those ancient battlefields; but the only man about whom we know anything definite is a very recent arrival on the cosmic stage.

When the Psalmist asked, "What is man?" he was seeking no answer from anthropology, biology or psychology. He had visioned man as central in some vast plan which he could but dimly imagine. The Power back of the starry heavens had included man, he believed, in its sublime purpose. And no scientific discoveries in the fields mentioned above, or kindred areas, have invalidated the Psalmist's faith in man's high place in that infinite plan. Indeed, the more we learn of man through science the more do we begin to see his centrality in the scheme of things as we know them.

Yet when we turn to a study of the history of civilizations, our own included, it is very apparent that he has never been accorded any such centrality. Without attempting to postulate an iron law of history which inevitably determines the downfall of civilizations, it is clear that something more than chance or fate has been at work during the past ages. In ancient Egypt, Greece and Rome, the three civilizations which have probably exercised greatest influence upon our own, there were still great wealth, skill and aggressiveness when decline became dominant; territorial and trade expansion, building and other activities, were the order of the day. Yet decline and eventual dissolution came upon them. Why? It would be easy, of course, to over-simplify the answer; but it surely is significant that something very similar was happening to man in each of those centers: the solid substantial class of small owners and business opera-

tors was slowly crushed out, leaving a small group of rich, powerful and wasteful rulers on the one hand; and a horde of miserable, pauperized human beings on the other.

A page out of old Grecian history in the days of Polybius should be suggestive: the middle class was dying; the rich were becoming richer and the poor poorer; there was a great influx of gold from the East; the cost of living advanced; luxuries became necessities; the poorer classes migrated, leaving a scarcity of labor for the farms, with the consequent diminishing of agriculture. This economic pressure reduced the birthrate, and there was no compensating immigration. These forces of break-up were operating in the presence of high intelligence. The ordinary Attic citizen who attended their assemblies was better educated in a political sense than are the members of the great legislative bodies of modern nations. Meander pictures the morals of that day, revealing a selfish, trivial, immoral and ignoble life. No person of distinction appears, either poet, philosopher, politician or benefactor. Not a single problem of social, religious or political importance was ever discussed. The higher society of Athens had abandoned the great human interests, and had narrowed and impoverished the real life of the people.

And that in outline, with many of the same details, is the story of the leading civilizations of the past. They failed not because they had exhausted their sources of material wealth, for they had not; but because they were unable properly to instrumentalize these back of a noble and adequate objective.

Is that, however, within the purpose of civilization? Is society under a mechanical or necessitated regime? Is this thing we call "civilization" a disease, as Carpenter maintained; or is it the last gasp of a dying culture, à la Spengler; or the final resort of rascals and robbers, as Rousseau held? If we look for a social control that has intelligence, purpose and goodness behind it, are we thereby demonstrating an unreasoning idealism? The philosophy of history expressed in the judgment, "The Most High ruleth in the affairs of men, and appointeth over the nations whomsoever he will," would be hard enough to uphold in the light of the records left by these ancient societies; but the opposite thesis that there is no evidence of purpose or control whatever is even more difficult to successfully maintain. Every human unit is a part of the social order before he becomes a true individual; and the process of individualizing can never be carried so far

that society can be safely bowed out of the picture. Whether we choose or not, we are dependents upon the group. The question, then, as to what will happen to individuals under any particular form of group dominance is one of deep and vital concern.

This matter of the collective purpose cannot be ignored. We have too easily yielded to mechanistic and structuralistic theories of civilization which were essentially blueprints of inevitable doom. To say that "Civilization is an organism like other organisms, its course is, in essential outline, pre-determined like that of a flower,"¹ is to fall back on a thinly disguised fatalism. The authors do seek to soften this statement by asserting that this control may be by a principle not "impersonal or material," but they leave no room for the operation of intelligence, if the individuals are merely cells in the social organism whose "essential outline" is determined by forces wholly outside themselves. Intelligence surely cannot rest in a theory which so completely displaces itself from any vital control over the social processes.

The fact that intelligence, seemingly, has never played a controlling part in social development up to date, does not argue that it cannot or will not. Soddy has suggested that every great social change in the past has been volcanic, coming from the lowest strata of society and bursting forth suddenly against pressure from above. The theories of Marx, Spengler and others on this point are too familiar to need mention. As a judgment of what has taken place in the past, at least concerning the changes which have occurred on the subsistence plane, it need not be argued. But the history of man, compared even with the life of this planet, is very brief. His upward climb to intelligence has been slow. If in that very recent period he has shown evidences at all of being self-directive or creative, then we must abandon the vegetative view of society. We dare look ahead to something other and better than a necessitated doom written deep in the structure of the non-personal. If society is in any way comparable to a "flower," then may we not allow human intelligence to play the rôle of the gardener? Even Karl Marx gave to violence no higher function than that of a midwife helping to bring in the ideal classless age where, presumably, intelligence and social good will would have to become the real constructive forces in any sort of a practical accomplishment of that ideal. And Spengler did cherish a rather weak hope that some future culture might

¹ *Civilization or Civilisations*, Goddard & Gibbons.

learn from the past sufficiently to escape what seemed to him the fatal periodicity that has doomed every civilization thus far.

The faith that intelligence will play an increasingly important rôle in civilization does not appear as a forlorn hope. The romance of modern science is one of the major characteristics of this age. By it man has learned more about his world, its forces, nature and mastery than has any previous age; and this knowledge has been more universalized and made a vital part of the everyday thinking of the average man than could ever have been possible before. And this latter fact is fully as significant as the former. There are, of course, many grotesque and suicidal factors still operative in modern life; but the existence of these does not justify either cynicism or despair concerning the future of the race.

But while a belief in intelligence as a controlling factor in civilization is more rational than to abandon the whole process to blind chance or iron necessity, we have accomplished very little if we stop there. Other civilizations have had high cultural levels coincident with decline. Intelligence must register in wise social action. What constitutes the good society? Can it be described in politico-economic terms? Let our negative reply be not too quickly or positively given. We cannot visualize the abundant life of which Jesus spoke coming to the masses while they are in breadlines, slums, and living on the poverty line. It was when the prodigal son began to feel the pangs of physical hunger that the call of the Father's home became insistent. There seems to be a fairly close relation between the stomach and the higher life.

But man is more than stomach, and must face other than stomach-questions. As Albert Schweitzer² has put it, "Civilization is the summary and content of all real advances of man and of society in all fields and in every direction *in so far as these are subordinate to the spiritual fulfillment of the individual.*" He believes that both West and East accept this view of the development of the individual as the goal, but that the West believes this is to be brought about by an equal emphasis upon the objective and the inner order, while the East holds that the external order must be escaped or mastered.

Western civilization has not, however, accepted any such goal; nor has it put an "equal emphasis" upon the non-material. Many have held with Kidd that the direction of social advance is toward the ever-increasing

² *Civilization and Ethics*, 7ff. (Italics mine.)

subordination of the individual to the good of the larger number. The philosophy of individualism, both rugged and ragged, is having no easy time today. Much of our present grief is seen as the direct progeny of the era of private initiative and control; and many are now quite willing to surrender, if necessary, individual liberty for some real sort of social and economic security. We seem to be definitely headed toward an era of greater collective action and control, which may continue two or more centuries.

This swing toward collectivism does not mean that the individual goal has been permanently abandoned. In our social tendencies the move to extremes which so frequently characterizes our actions may mean an undue subordination of the individual for a period, but there will be a return, let us hope never to the suicidal struggle of our "he-man age," to a saner and nobler individualism. Personality is too valuable to be sacrificed to the collective will, however imperative it may be to break from the destructive phases of the old order. It is quite likely that a few generations of social experimentation will make clear, what is now implicit in psychology, that the real self is a truly social product; that the individual who seeks to acquire and to appropriate for himself is not only a social monstrosity, but also an individual pervert, a throw-back to the jungle age. It is this barbaric hang-over from an animal past which has too largely dominated our systems and modes of living, and thus made impossible both a true society and worthy individuals. The end results of the social process must no longer be regarded as the creation of a few super-men; but rather the elevation and enrichment of all. We may cherish the hope that some of our weary adjectives, such as "red-blooded," "two-fisted," and "hard-boiled," may be permanently laid away, because they are socially dangerous and individually degrading when used as the expression of cherished ideals. The truly social individual will be sympathetic, co-operative and other-regarding, because upon such individuals will the permanence and strength of the social order depend.

Is it possible that anyone would argue that a society composed of such socially-minded persons would thereby depreciate the nature and worth of the individuals who composed it? Is one who is co-operative in spirit, with keen social imagination, less truly individual than those pugnacious, acquisitive, self-insulated beings who were spawned by a system that glorified individual initiative, achievement and appropriation? I see no conflict

between the positions of Schweitzer and Kidd; each emphasizes an essential and mutually compatible objective. A society which seeks the greatest good of the greatest number would certainly be advantaged by the fullest possible realization of the abundant life for each individual. The persistent attempt to separate these two divinely united purposes constitutes one of the most dangerous yet needless heresies of the present time. A satisfactory industrial product requires both a good machine and a good worker; it is not different with the social product. No number of good men working with a bad machine or system can achieve desirable ends.

To contend that the conversion of individuals is all that the religious forces should seek reveals something of the abyss into which a false individualism has plunged our social order. Competition and struggle, minority survival and mass destruction, have been assumed as so self-evident and primary as needing only to be stated in order to be accepted. Man was the enemy of men, Nature was a sort of cosmic "Old Mother Hubbard" whose cupboard was always bare, conflict and conquest were therefore inevitable; since nature was "red in tooth and fang" nurture should not seek to disturb so holy an order; progress and not peace was the social goal, and this could come only through a competitive struggle; the basic human right would be the right to fight, and perchance thereby survive. These are some of the downward steps over which an unbalanced individualism has sought—and almost succeeded—to drag our civilization to its destruction.

The logic of such a position means that civilization is for the few, the most rugged, the best fighters, the least considerate. "The greatest good for the least possible number" is the unannounced aim. Emblazoned along our highways today is that Stone Age philosophy, "That government is best which governs least," which means "That government is best which does the least for its people," the conception being that civilization is a fight, and that government is only the referee. This is horrible enough, surely, even if the "referee" were always impartial—a situation which rarely ever exists.

If civilization stands for the sum of those qualities which are essential to the largest realizations and satisfactions, then it must exist not for the few, but the many. It must be for man. If Jesus was right in assuming that humanity is capable of sometime becoming the family of God, then all are now potential members of that family. The only adequate goal for our

civilization, therefore, is to bring that potentiality into realization for the largest possible number. This is no bromidic conception, but will call for a social radicalism of the most profound sort. It will mean the revising, or replacement, of most of the basic laws upon our books. If our Constitution is chiefly centered around property, as some quite respectable persons seem to think, then it must have that center changed so as to swing around personality. Such a goal for civilization will mean the re-grounding of many of our institutions. It would not abolish the institution of private property, but it would put a new motive behind it that would drastically change its character and importance. Many hoary traditions would have to be surrendered, and vast social and individual pioneering would be required. Such a goal would not insure an upward course of inevitable progress and plenty; there would still be need for the sterner disciplines that make for largeness of life and liberation of spirit. It would open a way of attainable hope, however.

If the major purpose of civilization should be that of assuring to all its members the fullest and richest possible development of their capacities, then the quality of that life must become both the goal and the measure of progress. This would take us out of the rhetorical field where glowing rhapsodies over "inevitable progress" used to be so characteristic of the chronic booster, into an area of practical measurements and standards. The discerning ones have never been deceived by the statistics of bank and trade balances as being indicative of real progress. They have been concerned, rather, with what was happening to life in the process of trade and accumulation. The flood of things which so typified those oft-referred-to years of the middle twenties was coincident with the rapid spread of those vicious forces which so gravely imperil the peace and permanence of our present order. Man was not faring well at the hands of this highly extolled system.

While the abundant life is not to be interpreted in terms of "two cars in every garage," yet if life tomorrow is to be more worthy and rewarding for the average man than it has been in any of our yesterdays, then use must be made of every bit of scientific knowledge which we possess. This will mean more, and not fewer, machines; it will mean more luxuries; it will mean an increase in per capita wealth; it will not be a return to economic emptiness, sometimes euphemistically called, "the simple life," but it will bring about the most comprehensive and deep-reaching prosperity ever

known. It will be all of this not only because of sound economic procedure, but also because there is no cultural or moral value, or spiritual virtue in a system that compels abstinence here and promises abundance in the hereafter only.

Adequate material wealth equitably (not equally) distributed among all members of society is not, therefore, a matter of indifference to those who would build a truly Christian civilization. Concern and action at this point may be as spiritual as any activity in which the church can engage. But it does not constitute the major purpose in civilization. It would be entirely possible to achieve an adequate and just economic system and yet not escape the doom described by Goldsmith as a place "Where wealth accumulates and men decay." What men do to an economic system is important; but what the economic system does to man is far more significant. Ancient civilizations have perished in the very midst of wealth and splendor. The magnificence of old Egypt causes even our sophisticated age to gasp in awe and wonder. But they held life cheaply. They used a million slaves to build a tomb for one man. Ancient Athens poured out its cultured admiration for human life on a tragically limited area. It was only the beautiful body and the strong mind that was admired; her democracy was only by and for the elite. Even the worship of admirable virtues offers no true or adequate goal.

Our great problem is that of putting human life at the center of our civilization. "To live is the profession I would teach man," Rousseau declared. He believed that if man really learned that lesson he would have little difficulty in discharging the various duties which society might require. This primary emphasis upon life and man as opposed to the traditions, customs and institutions of society is a true insight, and need not, of course, lead to any of the anti-social conclusions that characterized this brilliant writer.

The re-centering of our whole collective life will not be as simple as Rousseau thought, but it is as imperative. We cannot reach our goal by retracing the steps up which man has come in his climb from the jungle. We cannot solve our problems by running away from them, even though we went to so understanding and comforting a friend as Nature. We need redeemers, not retreaters. Our essential problem is one of relationships, and would still be with us even if we could return to the handcraft age. We can look at a few prominent evils, as the mal-distribution of wealth or the

mechanization of life, until the whole desire is to escape those ills; but in themselves they are only symptoms of a deeper ailment. Gandhi has evidently pretty thoroughly subdued the acquisitive instinct in himself; but if all India could share with him his success at this point it would not thereby reach the goal we have in mind. Self-denial has its proper and most important place in any Christian scheme of things, but when John said of Jesus, "In him was life," he had discerned a far more central and constructive fact. And when he further declared that that "life was the light of men" he set forth the essential approach to this task.

One of the most difficult attitudes to maintain today is that of faith in the masses. Democracy is definitely imperiled not so much from the failure of political functions as from the breakdown of this faith. And this skepticism is fed from many sources. We have come under the spell of some super-man theory, or of some race or class superiority prejudice, and have dropped that article out of our creed. We have confused inherent inequality of capacities and inherent equality of opportunities. Or we have put our trust in a blind evolutionary process which seems to care more for types than for individuals, and have said with Giddings,³ "The function of society is to develop the higher types of personality." If he had said "qualities" instead of "types" our faith might have been saved; but the dogma opens the door to a hopelessly "lower" type, the unemployable, the industrially unfit, the economic slave, the one who must live upon the bounty of others.

Of course these less favored "types" do exist, and in large numbers. Their presence confronts every program for social betterment. Are they the necessary price that we must pay for what we so hopefully call "civilization"? The danger here is that we will rest our concept of "capacity" on too narrow a foundation. Giddings seems to have done that,⁴ when he says that those who might have rendered service under an older and simpler form of life, but could not adjust themselves to the newer and more complicated demands of this day . . . should be continued in unprofitable service (as pensioners). Is one, therefore, to be classed as a pauper because he is unable to produce a profit for some employer? Is that to be the sole test of one's contribution to society?

In Millet's painting, "The Angelus," he portrays two peasants digging

³ *Studies in the Theory of Human Society*, p. 291.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 237.

potatoes, who might in all likelihood be classed as pensioners in a more complex social order. Yet the artist shows that they do share in three very important social contributions: work that is useful; love which builds the family, and furnishes the dynamic for work; and worship, where the finite seeks fellowship with the Infinite. Shall we say that their contribution to society must be measured solely by the size of their pile of potatoes? Are we willing to judge human capacity by any such standard as that? The "Cotter" in Burns's memorable poem contributed to "Scotia's grandeur" not so much by the toil of his hands—others were doing that—as by the spirit that illumined the little cottage as if from celestial flame. We will not, of course, close our eyes to the very apparent differences in human capacities; nor will we underestimate the significance of these differences in any just and adequate order of life. But neither must we fail to set up a standard of value big enough to comprehend the capacities which are possessed. The total quality of life must be that standard.

There is an inherent worthfulness in human life that separates the human from all lower forms. And this worthfulness is only partly revealed in his capacities. It more particularly inheres in that view which regards man as a fundamental part of that "far off divine event toward which the whole creation moves." The humble worker, inadequately geared to a high-speed age, may still be making an entirely worthy and needed contribution to his age. But even so, this is not the most important consideration. A democracy based on the equal ability and rights of its members will fail; but one based on the "uncommon fineness in the common man," his independent and equal worth in the long purposes of God, will survive. In a deep sense we are only, as yet, candidates for humanity; but that we are on the ticket should give us great courage.

The Man Who Saw the Grace of God

A Study of Barnabas

WILFRID L. HANNAM

A NICKNAME, so the dictionary tells us, is an "eke-name"—a name given in addition, marking some peculiarity of appearance or disposition in its bearer. Usually it remains an additional name, employed behind a master's back by sniggering schoolboys, or by a man's intimates in familiar converse. We learn, for instance, from the sober columns of the *London Times* that an English nobleman, recently deceased, was known to his boon companions as "Beef"; and it only required one glance at the peer's portrait to see its aptness.

The New Testament tells us the singular story of a man who lost his real name so utterly that, after his formal introduction to us (Acts 4. 36), it is never mentioned again; the apostles had found a better name for him. By common consent, apparently, the nickname took the place of that which his parents had given him, because it described him exactly. There were many Josephs, but alas, they were not all like this one, and those who knew him best paid Joseph, the Levite from Cyprus, the high compliment of forgetting his birthplace, his tribe, and the name he was born with, remembering only the name he had earned by virtue of his character.

To arrive at the real meaning of that nickname is not plain sailing, as the scholars will be quick to inform us. They will not accept, without demur, Luke's translation of it as "son of exhortation," or as the margin has it, "the son of consolation"; but say that Barnabas really means "son of Nebo" or "son of the prophet," or "son of prophecy"—which is doubtless very illuminating to them, but is a trifle obscure to the ordinary reader. He will do well to remember that Luke had one undeniable advantage over his modern interpreters in actually knowing the man himself, and the circles in which the name was current. We will, therefore, say no more about "the son of Nebo," but watch Luke as he paints the picture of the man who, he says, was known to everybody as "the son of consolation, or comfort." To appreciate Luke's handiwork we must first of all notice a peculiarity of his method. He does not complete the portrait at one sitting, nor keep his subject fixed in one pose. He introduces him abruptly, tells us who he

was, whence he came, and one deed he did; and then banishes him from his narrative until he sees fit to bring him in again to tell us more about him. This unwonted procedure occurs more than once, until the day when we see him for the last time, sailing away to Cyprus, whence he came at first; and after that—silence! Then, when at length we realize that Luke will tell us no more about him, we discover how much he has told us already, and that we know him quite well, and that Barnabas has won a permanent place in our affection.

Luke does not tell us why Joseph of Cyprus left his island home and found his way to Jerusalem; but it was quite as natural for a young Levite to seek out the Holy City as it is for a steel filing to yield to the attraction of the magnet. One thing was certain—that being there he would seek out his relatives, for he had an aunt living in Jerusalem whose name was Mary (cf. Acts 12. 12 with Colossians 4. 10); and with her son John Mark, his own cousin, he formed a friendship that was to have important consequences for both of them.

Now it happened that Mary's house was the rallying ground of the new and much talked-of sect that dared to say that the Messiah had come already—was, indeed, none other than the Nazarene prophet who had been crucified a short while before. If it did not involve us in too formidable a digression, it would be interesting to track down the references which explain why it was that the first followers of "The Way" felt particularly at home in Mary's house. Read, for instance, the fourteenth chapter of Mark's Gospel, noting well that young man who "left the linen cloth and fled naked" from the Garden after the Master's arrest; then pick up the thread again at Acts 1. 13, "the upper chamber where they were abiding"; then on to Acts 12. 12, where Peter, released from prison, finds his way "to the house of Mary, the mother of John whose surname was Mark, where many were gathered together and were praying." Suppose, and it is a credible supposition, that the Last Supper had been celebrated in that Upper Room in Mary's house, and that John Mark himself was the young man who had fled from the Garden; and you will understand why that house, above all others in Jerusalem, was hallowed ground to the friends of Jesus, and why they were always sure of a welcome there. Thus it would come about that, by an accident of kinship, the young Levite from Cyprus found his way to the fountainhead of Christianity, and joined the church in his aunt's upper room.

It is just at this point that Luke grants us our first glimpse of the Joseph who was so soon to lose his birthname, and what he tells us is a presage of what was to follow. He was a man with landed property—an unusual thing for a Levite. He sold it, "and brought the money, and laid it at the apostles' feet." That is all that Luke vouchsafes to tell us at present; but we, who are privileged to know his after history, pause to consider the significance of that first act. There was something so spontaneous and generous about it that it won the admiration of all who watched him, thereby exciting the envy of Ananias and Sapphira, who wanted the admiration without being prepared to pay the price! Luke is in his element with such a contrast to depict, but we are concerned here with Joseph the Cypriote alone. To him, joining the Church meant a complete identification of his own fortunes with that of the community. He knew, probably as well as anybody else, that he was not joining a perfect body; but he also knew that he was joining a body with a perfect ideal, and that his own duty was to join the imperfect Church and lift it, so far as he was able, nearer to the ideal of its Head.

Down falls the curtain, and we know no more of Barnabas until much else has happened; and chief among the events which follow is the appearance on the scene of Saul of Tarsus. How that little group of friends in Mary's house must have dreaded that name; and with what a mingled sigh, partly relief and partly fear, they must have heard of his departure from Jerusalem to Damascus—relief, because while he was away they would be delivered from their bitterest persecutor; fear, because they knew full well the errand that took him to Damascus, and the havoc he would inflict upon their comrades there.

Time passes, and lo, a stranger is knocking at Mary's door in Jerusalem. We do not know if it was Rhoda, the servingmaid, who answered the summons this time, as she did when she ran in to say that Peter was standing at the gate; but the surprise of her announcement then was as nothing to the consternation caused by the news that Saul of Tarsus stood without, asking to come in! Are you surprised that Luke should have to write, "And when he (Saul) was come to Jerusalem, he essayed to join himself to the disciples; and they were all afraid of him, not believing that he was a disciple"? (Acts 9. 26.)

If you had been a member of their company, all too well aware of the reputation of the man outside, would you have been eager to admit him?

When you thought of your relatives and friends who had been done to death because of this man's fanaticism how could you hesitate for a single moment as to the only possible course to follow? Prudence and logic agreed that the only place for Saul of Tarsus was outside—and save for one man, that is where he would have stayed! “Don’t you see the diabolical cunning of the man?” caution would argue; “We did at least give him credit for being an open and avowed enemy, but we were wrong; he is seeking now to find his way into our midst, and when he has us all taped and measured, we shall be arrested and no man’s life will be worth a moment’s purchase. Keep him out!”

There can be no doubt that Saul would have been excluded if the prevailing sentiment of the church members had been successful—with what dire results to all after-history! Try to imagine the Christian Church without Saul of Tarsus, and you will get some idea of the importance of the decision the Christian community had to make. It is not too much to say that the future of Christianity itself as a world-religion, trembled in the balance while Saul was kept waiting at the door. Without him the Church would have remained a Jewish sect, destined to be engulfed in the disasters that awaited Jerusalem in the days now so near at hand.

It is at that moment of crisis that Luke reintroduces Barnabas—who is known no longer as Joseph, the Levite from Cyprus. In the interval, since we saw him last, he has earned his nickname! He it is who steps forward and saves the Church from a disastrous error—an error, let it be repeated, for which so many powerful arguments could be urged. “But Barnabas took him, and brought him to the apostles, and declared unto them how he had seen the Lord in the way, and that he had spoken unto him, and how at Damascus he had preached boldly in the Name of Jesus” (Acts 9. 27). “You cannot shut him out,” he said, “for if the Lord has spoken to him, you and I must do the same.”

When last we saw Barnabas he was bringing money to the apostles’ feet; but now he was bringing far richer treasure—a redeemed and dedicated man, who shows immediately his worth as a reinforcement—“And he was with them, going in and going out at Jerusalem, preaching boldly in the Name of the Lord; and he spake and disputed against the Grecian Jews.” What he said to them we do not know, for Luke is the kind of writer who is always willing to leave something to his readers’ imagination. Of one thing we can be certain, and that is that the converted man

was far more potent than any arguments he used, for who could gainsay the evidence of divine power when the pupil of Gamaliel stood there among his unlearned and ignorant companions, willing and eager to avow that they had been right, and that he had been wrong? Little wonder that Jewish anger blazed against the renegade, as they regarded him, and that they "went about to kill him." How much food there is for reflection in the next thing Luke tells us, that when "the brethren knew his danger, they brought him down to Caesarea, and sent him forth to Tarsus." It is that word "brethren" in such a context that holds the thought. Only a verse or two back we were told that these same men had been "all afraid" of the man they now reckon as their brother, and for that change of attitude Barnabas was directly responsible. If he had not intervened to save them from their own prudent shortsightedness, there would have been a sadly different tale to tell.

Once again the veil falls before our eyes, for Saul and Barnabas both pass out of the picture for a season. Saul is at Tarsus waiting for his life's work; and how long he waited remains uncertain. Sir William Ramsay thinks it must have been nearly eight years, Professor Findlay says eleven years; we do not know how long it was, but Saul has full claim upon our sympathy. He is in his hometown, which had once been proud of him, and now looks upon him as a brain-turned pervert. There is a fire burning in his soul, lit in that moment long ago on the Damascus highway when a Voice had said, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou Me? It is hard for thee to kick against the goad." Yes, but it is just as hard, if not harder, to wait there in the place that had given him birth and is now heartily ashamed of him, with no indication as to the work the Lord had for him to do. As we think about him, sure of his call but ignorant as to where he is to serve, we have enough to remind us, the next time we are impatient because our prayers for guidance are not answered immediately, that our period of suspense is but a hand's breadth in comparison with that of Saul of Tarsus, waiting in his hostile birthplace for a summons which never seemed to come.

Our concern is with Barnabas, whom we must assume spent the interval in Jerusalem, justifying in a thousand unknown ways his new name as "the son of consolation." Then once more we see him, this time at Antioch in Syria (Acts 11. 22), the emissary of the Church at Jerusalem, sent North to advise the brethren there as to their course of action. They have been

seriously perturbed by an undreamed-of occurrence, for which there was no precedent. Certain men of Cyprus and Cyrene, fugitives from persecution nearer home, had come to Antioch, and there had found themselves "preaching to the Greeks also Jesus as Lord." Until then "they had spoken the word to none, save only to Jews," but in cosmopolitan Antioch, where men of all nations met, they could not select their audiences to please themselves, and Greeks—real Greeks this time, not Grecian Jews like those who had opposed Saul in Jerusalem—had heard their message, and received it.

Conceive, if you can, the embarrassment of orthodox Jewish Christians at such an unforeseen development—Jews and Greeks praying together with all thoughts of racial difference forgotten. Maybe the missionaries themselves were alarmed at the consequences of their own act, and were anxious to know whether the apostles at headquarters in Jerusalem would disapprove. As Luke tells the story, we are left to infer that this enlargement of their mission owed nothing to the deliberate intention of these men of Cyprus and Cyrene. They had meant to tell the Jews who dwelt in Antioch that the Messiah had come—that was the message of which they were certain—but they had not reckoned on the Greeks saying "He belongs to us also; you call Him Messiah—we call Him Saviour, and He is ours as well as yours!" A thing so unthought of called for immediate investigation, and in response to their appeal the apostles send Barnabas, possibly because as a man of Cyprus himself he was the best fitted to advise his bewildered fellow-countrymen.

What a blessing it was—Barnabas! Suppose that some stiff-necked, over-conscientious Judaizer had come from Jerusalem to conduct the investigation; how he would have frowned upon the unheard of and unseemly sight, and what rules and regulations he would have devised in the interests of order and discipline! But Barnabas was a man of another temper. Now, at length, Luke enables us to see the full stature of the man; for where his confused and dubious fellow-believers could only see a difficulty, he saw "the grace of God, and was glad." To him it did not matter a bit that this thing had never happened before, and that it was not the result of human planning and intention. The thing that mattered was that it was entirely and utterly good, the plainest proof to his eyes that God had willed it—God, who does not wait until His timorous worshipers have made up their minds, but goes before them, confronting them with accomplished facts, to which they must adjust themselves.

Listen to the advice he gives them: "he exhorted them all that with purpose of heart they would cleave unto the Lord." That is to say, "Get as near to Jesus as you can; avoid the things which belong to the circumference, and press inwards toward the center. That will prevent you from quarreling about the irrelevant things, belonging to your racial origins and antecedents. The nearer you get to Him who is your common Lord, the less likely you are to fall out among yourselves."

If only the Christian Church, throughout its long and checkered history, had remembered that counsel, how many quarrels and fratricidal wars would have been avoided! It is the subsidiary things, magnified out of all proportion, and given primary place, that have done the mischief.

Even more important was Barnabas's next act. He recognized that this new kind of Christian Church, in which racial distinctions had been transcended, needed a new kind of leader, and he knew where the man was to be found. "And he went forth to Tarsus to seek for Saul" (Acts 11. 25). Had the two men never met since that far-off day when the brethren in Jerusalem, to save Saul's life, had sent him to Tarsus? So it would seem, if we are to give full value to Luke's carefully chosen verbs. "He went forth to *seek* for Saul, and when he had *found* him, he brought him unto Antioch." The sentence is easily written, but how much time and trouble on Barnabas's part does it represent, and what momentous consequences depended on the search. We have seen Saul, sure of his call to preach, but entirely in the dark as to the work for which he is intended: we have seen a situation created in Antioch by men completely unaware of the true significance of their own acts—frightened by them rather than elated; and now once more we see Barnabas doing the necessary work of bringing the designated man to the divinely created opening.

The superficial thing is to praise his acumen, and applaud his insight, and Luke does neither, but he leaves us in no doubt at all as to his explanation of Barnabas's crowning service to the Church of Christ. He finds it in his character—"He was a good man, full of the Holy Ghost and of faith." Those are not two things, but one—the faith being the practical expression of his implicit trust in the guidance of the Holy Spirit. If we can fathom that sentence we shall understand the secret of Barnabas—and much else beside. This is an illustration of the way in which the early Church arrived at its theology—it was forced to enlarge its views of God by the pressure of

events, and to learn from unexpected happenings that His ways were not as their ways. As Professor Macmurray has reminded us, "Faith," both in the Synoptic Gospels and in the New Testament, generally cannot be equated with "belief"; it is "venture," resulting in the discovery that God has prepared the way for those who in good heart and true obedience follow the Spirit's leading into new fields of opportunity and service.

Thus it is that the "good man, full of the Holy Spirit and of faith" brings Saul to the beginning of his life's work. We might follow the course of the reunited friends a little further, until the day when "a sharp contention" divided them, with John Mark as the cause of their quarrel, and all our sympathies would lie with Barnabas. But it is perhaps enough to have seen in him the man who, when he joined the Church, put his all into the common stock; who believed that God has His chosen servants in unlikely places, and that converted persecutors make the very best Christian witnesses; and, above all, that new situations and troubled horizons should leave the followers of Jesus undisturbed and unafraid.

In these fateful days, when men's hearts fail for fear, an embarrassed Church and a bemused world need men of the Barnabas pattern, who in the very troubles of the time can see the grace of God. Too many of our contemporaries are seeing other things; threatening omens of a renewed race in armaments and the imminent breakdown of civilization, consequent upon the modern man's loss of faith in a controlling Personal Purpose. Like Mr. Walter Lippmann, they are oppressed with a sense "of the turmoil and the squalor and the explosiveness of modern civilization," and they look vainly round for any effective remedy. Ever since the War man's confidence in his power to dominate his environment has been rudely shaken, and the members of the Christian Churches have not been immune from this malaise. To all such pessimism the "sons of consolation" have an answer ready—so far from losing heart, and despairing, they rejoice that they have been born in such a day, for they have the best of all good news to give to troubled hearts and fearful minds:

"By Thine unerring Spirit led,
We shall not in the desert stray;
We shall not full direction need,
Nor miss our providential way;
As far from danger as from fear,
While love, almighty love, is near."

In a Time Like This

CARL S. PATTON

I AM writing particularly from the viewpoint of the Church and its ministers. I begin negatively by saying that it is not a time of moral degeneration. Human nature has not suddenly gone bad. The old question whether human nature changes or not, is largely a matter of words. There probably has been a slow but somewhat continuous improvement in it since the beginning. But it certainly never undergoes any sudden change. There are occasions, like war, when the evil passions of men are let loose. But the evil passions were there all the time. There are periods of lawlessness and crime. They usually indicate some maladjustment of social machinery—the breakdown of the police power, a temporary failure of government. There is an occasional emergence of peculiarly shocking crime, like kidnaping and gang murder, where the evil passions of men seem to be suddenly concentrated and to break into the open. There has been recently a sudden swing to so-called “liberalism,” seen in gambling and sexual looseness, where, for some reason, the ordinary restraints have been temporarily let down and certain propensities get out of bounds. Our time has seen and still sees much of all this.

But the total amount of human cussedness is probably somewhere near constant. The impression that human nature has gone bad is largely created by newspapers, which feature every sort of crime and scandal; by novels, which flourish on and appeal to exaggerated or perverted sex instincts; and by the moving pictures, which apparently could hardly live at all without appeal to the morbid and the outré. But if anyone wants an indication of the general soundness and sobriety of the morals of the American people, let him look for it in this depression through which we are still passing. That there has been so much excuse for violence and so little violence; and on the whole so little envy and hatred, even in the midst of such social injustice—is certainly a tribute to the moral stability of our people.

In the second place, it is not a period of religious decline. Some preachers are always anxious to prove that religion is in a bad way. One might think they were afraid of losing their jobs for lack of any patients on whom to practice. They are like the old Puritan divine, who had to

prove that human nature was altogether bad, in order to get any purchase on it. Religion, like morality, never suddenly goes to pieces. It takes new forms. It develops new doctrines. It turns from one avenue to another. It adjusts itself to new scientific conceptions and social conditions. But it keeps on, a somewhat constant but gradually increasing element in human culture. Even organized religion is not these days in a bad way. I am obliged to confess that I do not see any such "revolt against God" as Stanley High wrote about in an issue of *Harper's*; or any such "Decay of Religion" as Doctor Dieffenbach exposed in an issue of *Current History*, some months ago. In fact, if the banks and the railroads and the manufacturing concerns had come through the depression as well as the churches, we should hardly have known that there was a depression.

If these two things, that are sometimes said to be so, are not so, some other things are true of this present time which vitally affect the kind of religion people need in these days.

It is still a period of depression. It is not the business of the Christian Church to do the work for which other agencies are organized. But it is part of its business to furnish the moral power and the personnel which enable all other rebuilding agencies to function. The Christian Church must not be indifferent to human need. It may go off the track theologically—into the swamp of fundamentalism, or the fog of humanism—but it will recover, and no great harm done. But if it forgets the troubles of men, it might as well give up its name. It is the business of the Church to see that people come through this present period of social maladjustment with as little hatred and envy and as much hope and as much love for their fellows as possible. This cannot be done by blinking the real problems that confront society, and there is no question of human justice which has not a place of interest and understanding in the Christian pulpit. But there is misunderstanding and mutual recrimination enough already, and so far as is possible the people should be helped to think profitably and hopefully about these things, and at the same time, and more immediately, encouraged to lend a hand in whatever opportunity opens before them.

Before the depression began, this time was, and after the depression it will continue to be, a machine age. The machine age, to be sure, did not begin with the Armistice nor with the depression. But during the war and the years that immediately followed it, it entered upon a new and acute

stage. Technological unemployment was not a discovery of technocracy. It was indeed a thing that had been going on progressively and increasingly for many years, but whose proportions had been hidden from us for a time by the abnormal years of prosperity that followed the World War. It seems to be true that we have three times as many shoe factories as we need to produce all the shoes we can wear, and that if we were to go back immediately to the output of 1929, we could produce that output and still leave vast numbers of our people unemployed. All this is serious enough, but it is not the only result of the machine age.

A more general result of it has been a standardization of life, the production of a society made up largely of interchangeable parts; where one man is as good as another, and each can take the other's place without anybody's knowing the difference. What we have to watch out for in these days is the general belittlement of man. Personality is the finest fruit of the total process of evolution up to the present point. It is, in the last analysis, the one great concern of the Church. In a world which valued personality as it should, and pray God as it sometime will, industry would be organized, not merely for the output of goods, but equally and even primarily for the preservation and enhancement of human personality.

I do not believe there is any agency in the world so well calculated to enforce the value of personality as religion. He who has any insight into human values, any high estimate, such as Jesus Himself had, of the human soul, any inkling of how to bring home to people the fact that all our values are spiritual values, that our only real failure is a spiritual failure, and our only success a spiritual success; he who, in this machine age, can exalt the things of the human spirit as poets and prophets have always done—let him say his say with conviction and with a glad heart. For his message will come home to people who sadly need it in this age when the belittlement of man is so easy.

It is an uncertain time. People are confused, not only about political and economic matters; and not only are they pried loose from many religious convictions, but this uncertainty sometimes touches things more fundamental even than these. It is a period of shifting standards; and a knowledge of the fact that there seems to be nothing which has been considered wrong or ugly or untrue at one time which has not at some other time been considered right or true or beautiful, has led many people to feel that there is no ultimate truth or beauty or goodness, that nothing is

sure except that nothing is sure, and that our moral life is adrift upon a sea where no ports are certain. If he who is convinced, as I personally am, that this is a profound error; who feels that there are eternal values, and that while we move, we move always either toward or away from goals that were laid down when human nature was made; if he will make this clear to people, though he will not stop all moral drifting, he will dispel a certain fog of ideas which makes any sure moral direction difficult or impossible.

It is a time when people feel the seriousness of life. They are not in a flippant mood, and no one who is in that mood can have any influence upon them. Preachers are not much given to this mood; there is not much in their calling to encourage it. In fact, they are probably more prone to the opposite extreme. Sometimes it has seemed to me that no man who was naturally over-serious, ought to go into the Christian ministry. I remember such a man in my college days, who explained to us, in class prayer meeting, that he never did anything without asking himself whether he could do it for the glory of God. He went into detail and said that he asked himself this question when he refused or accepted his dessert at dinner. To go through the world pointing to every piece of pie and asking, "Is it to the glory of God, or not"—how terrible! Any man who goes along by instinct, if his instincts are anywhere near right, and who reserves his serious consideration for things that are really serious, will get twice as far.

Just the same, there is a kind of earnestness which is compatible with a wholesome and cheerful view of life, and without which no man's word is worth much in the pulpit. People will take him more seriously about serious things if he doesn't take everything seriously, but moral earnestness he just must have. He must have it in all times, but especially he must have it in a time like this, when the seriousness of life has come home to people almost like a new revelation. The glory of Puritanism was its seriousness. It taught people that they were not to hover over life like a butterfly, nor play with it like a kitten, nor worry it like a puppy; but to understand it, and to grapple with it, and to make something out of it. If he who believes today that there is before society and before every individual man a destiny which cannot be achieved without prayer and effort and strong trying, will bring that home to people, then to the people who hear and heed him the seriousness of life will not be a mere oppressive fact, but a liberating force.

The present time is also a thoughtful and inquiring time. It is not an age of authority. Men who know but little of science are nevertheless imbued with the scientific spirit of inquiry. Men to whom philosophy is an unopened book are nevertheless asking themselves, "How do we know?" and especially, "How do we know about religion?" Is there this one field in which we do not have to think, as we do in every other, but where we can merely be told, as we cannot anywhere else? It is time that people were told and made to understand that religion is a human product, like art or politics or anything else, and that there is no magic or mystic way of coming to an understanding of it. Not everything has to be proved. As Professor Hocking has somewhere said, "Nothing can be true for a reason, unless something is true without a reason"; otherwise, we should never come to an end nor have any place to start from. But aside from a few fundamental, simple, moral and spiritual intuitions, the whole sphere of religion is one for human inquiry, in which every man must search for his own truth and find it wherever he can.

This should be made plain to folks. To do so will not lead to skepticism, nor to revolt. It will, rather, enable people to use their reason on the subject of religion, openly and frankly, as they do in regard to other interests. It will relieve many sensitive spirits of the feeling that they are doing something wrong when they question long-accepted religious ideas. It will add dignity to the intellectual life of spiritually-minded people in a thoughtful and inquiring time like this.

It is a time when people feel, as never before, the inequalities of human life. Perhaps these inequalities are more glaring now than they have usually been. At all events there is an outspoken opinion, quite unprecedented in extent, that it is neither right nor necessary that some people should have so much, and others so little. It seems, somehow, to contradict the fundamental principles of the gospel of Jesus. And we are no longer satisfied with explanations of it. There is naturally no great envy against ordinarily prosperous people in America. On the contrary there is often a very great unthinking admiration of mere wealth. But when one man can lose fifty million dollars in one year, sixty million the next, and at the end of that time have three hundred and eight million dollars cash on hand, with four hundred and fifty millions of undivided property between himself and his two partners—it begins to come over even the most unenvious man that this particular man has been pretty well

paid. There is a reason for the popularity of such books as *Mellon's Millions* and *The Robber Barons*. This reason is not discreditable. It is not rooted in mere envy or irritation. It is due to the general feeling that the goods of the world are not at present distributed in a Christian way. People do not deny that great fortunes can be made, not only honestly, but with a return to society which justifies the accumulation of the fortune. But they are tremendously impressed with the fact that not many great fortunes appear to have been made in that way.

This feeling, not only of the inequalities of life, but of the essential injustice of these inequalities, is not only abroad in the world today but is generally shared by Christian ministers. I would not say one who dare not speak his mind on such questions, always with tact and good sense and yet with all directness, should necessarily go into the real-estate or the insurance business—I should hate to see those well-trodden paths beaten any harder by the feet of a lot of ex-clergymen—but I would say that he is robbed of half his power as a Christian preacher. In the Middle Ages, when everybody was supposed to have been born to a certain station in life, and when all human inequalities were assumed to be justified by a providence only too often and too suggestively referred to as “inscrutable,” such a man might have done pretty well. But not in an age which takes the inequalities of life as our age does.

I need hardly add, but I will add it, lest I seem to have forgotten it, that this is a time when people need personal religion. People always need that, to be sure. And a man who cannot hold his religion in times of prosperity has either not enough or not the right kind. But taking human nature in the large, it is in times like these that people feel most deeply the need of personal reassurance. It is a time of widespread frustration, when ambitions are defeated and hopes have gone down, and spirits are sick, even unto death. It is a time, therefore, when people need again to be assured that there is a healing power in nature, in human life, running all through the universe, originating in the heart of God Himself, working for ever for forgiveness and recovery, and redemption. For such a religion a time like this calls in a voice choked with the tears of disappointed hopes, bitter often with the sense of injustice, but strong with a trust that will not be denied. And who shall speak this word of reassurance, if not believers in the gospel of Jesus Christ? And when should they speak it, if not in a time like this?

Manchurian Miniatures

FRED D. GEALY

I

MILITARY planes are circling overhead, and we can scarcely hear the preacher who is explaining to a Japanese audience in Mukden the difference between a religion of "works" and a religion of "grace." But he lifts his voice to a higher pitch, and now neither the planes in the sky nor the passing bells on the back of the soiled-gray Chinese horse, struggling at the incessant bite of a Chinese lash to pull a dilapidated droshky along the street outside, can prevent us from hearing that we mortals cannot obey the laws of God to perfection, and that if we are saved it will not be because of what we do or don't do, but because God is the Gracious One by whom in faith alone salvation is.

I have heard this doctrine all my life and I know and am glad that it is true, but I am spending tonight in the guest room of the South Manchurian Railway Company Club House, surrounded by imposing houses covering city blocks, built by the Railway Company for its employees. All day I have been observing aspects of the incredible economic penetration of the South Manchurian Railway into Manchuria, and tonight the old argument about "works" and "grace" seems unimportant if not unreal. Here are indeed works aplenty—lumber mills, paper mills, bean-oil and bean-cake mills, flour mills, pig-iron and steel mills, and what you will; but these are not "works" as the preacher uses the word. These works are not done that anyone may thereby climb the steep ascent of heaven; they are done to make money.

And yet this is perhaps not quite fair. Life is not so simple. In modern times the desire for self-expression, self-realization, finds most ready release in the exploitation of undeveloped natural resources. Men want money, but they also want power, they want to feel important as change-producers and change-controllers in historic process. Modern man is an explorer, an investigator, a producer, an initiator. He must make life move. These irrepressible urges toward an adventurous life will not be denied. And that they result in profits is the symbol which seems to give validity

and rationality to the whole involved process. The use of money is pleasurable and without its returns and ensuing power and prestige the natural man would find no incentive to carry on the elaborate labor process; rather, like the Koreans who were robbed by their ancient rulers of all they could accumulate, he would sink back into indolence and poverty, happy with a thin pipe of tobacco and perchance a wife to beat his white clothes clean and scratch for a bit of food for him.

Thus greed alone is not an adequate explanation for the sort of economic penetration which is typified by the history of the South Manchurian Railway, although it comes perilously near to seeming so when one observes the more cruel and inhuman side of the industrial order which is the form that economic penetration of today inevitably takes. Most men do not work merely for money, nor will they work without it. Yet it is the desire to accumulate and amass fortune which dominates the industrial life of the world today.

For the moment the droning of the planes has ceased; only the droning of the preacher goes on. But the pilots are not asleep, if some members of the congregation are. If we, with the world that we have made, are not brought to specific radical moral judgment, why should not men sleep when grace is preached?

II

The Japanese are the only people in the East who know what they want and who have a plan for its accomplishment. Only the Japanese as a people are self-conscious—that is, are a group-person in the sense of having a unified directive mind such as leads them to control their environment rather than be controlled by it. The Chinese here in the walled town of Mukden live under their crowded gray-tiled roofs from generation to generation. They make money, and get fat and round, and wear their pretty silks—or blue rags—indifferent to change except as it has to do with money-making. But 20,000,000 Chinese migrating into Manchuria wouldn't influence it as much as 20,000 Japanese. The Chinese are like sand. The Japanese have an intensity of organization not known elsewhere in the East. Wherever they are, they immediately begin to manage, control, govern, develop, expand.

Of the Koreans one does not know what to say. In the labored English translation of Governor-General Ugaki's speech to the Middle School

principals in Seoul, 1934, he complained: "Generally speaking, that we could not remedy these bad conditions and save the farmers from poverty easily, since the time of amalgamation, has been due to the lack of self-confidence among the Korean farmers." Does the General not know that if Korean farmers had the self-confidence he would like them to have they would not tolerate even his presence in Korea let alone allow him to plan for their economic salvation? In Korea every modern engineering project of any kind is the work of Japan. The Koreans are like sheep, gentle and helpless in the fierce strife of the modern world. Is there any future for them except what the Great Empire of Japan may deign to grant them in exchange for their loyalty?

Mr. Gibbon observed that it was their discipline "to which the Romans owed their empire over so many other nations, as warlike and more powerful than themselves."¹ Likewise it is their discipline, their organization, their unity, their planfulness which gives the Japanese pre-eminence in the Orient. Man for man, Chinese, Korean, Japanese—you may close your eyes and take your pick; all are equally interesting and capable. But as a people, only the Japanese feel themselves to be a unity and have created a technique for giving it a cutting edge.

III

A Russian girl with crimsoned toe-nails peering through dainty white leather sandals, a Chinese woman in turquoise blue hobbling with bound feet, a Korean garbed in stiff, voluminous white linen, a Japanese lady with silk parasol and kimono of pastel shades; a Russian man with the crucifix tattooed on his chest; Chinese and Russian traffic policemen with cherry-blossom buttons; Japanese department stores with Russian saleswomen selling Japan-made merchandise to Chinese patrons while the radio plays "Home, Sweet Home"; Russian restaurants with Chinese waiters; a cinema showing an American musical romance talkie, with Russian, Chinese, and Japanese explanations flashed on the edge of the screen; Chinese rikishas, Russian droshkies, old Fords, donkeys, bulls; the Sungari river; pleasure boats, barges, gunboats, fortified bridges patrolled by Japanese soldiers—this is the international medley called Harbin, a city young as cities go—hardly forty years old and yet bedraggled and degenerate, showing signs of premature old age.

¹ *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, p. 134 (Modern Library Edition).

In the old days Harbin was a gay center of Russian provincial life. Burly men with bushy beards drank amber tea from glistening samovars. Cabarets and ballet-dancing enlivened the evening tedium of men far from the mother country. Byzantine-domed churches loomed above the city houses. Fat Russian women reverently kissed the sacred feet of crucifixes and prayed before the ikons. Heavily gowned priests intoned the deep Russian liturgy. And Russian merchants flocked into the open door of the East. Then came the Russo-Japanese war. The hopes of the Czars for a port at Dalny were shattered. Dalny became Dairen. The grand Russian plans for a magnificent city were executed by the Japanese, and today Dairen—now a typical Japanese city, except on a more spacious scale—is the cleanest and most attractive city in Manchuria. Japanese residents in Dairen, and, indeed, in other cities of Manchuria, complain that they can find nothing of interest in the stores to take as gifts when they return to the homeland because nearly everything on sale is “made in Japan.”

Dairen is a symbol of what other Manchurian cities will likely become. Changchun, or Hsingking, or Shinkyo (New Capital), as the Japanese call it, was never an important city under former regimes, and Russian influence there was never very great. Mukden has always been a town of interest because it was the center of government, if the misrule of war-lords is to be dignified by so grand a word. The great yellow tile roofs of the palace once inhabited by Chang Tso-lin and his son Chang Hsueh-liang can yet be seen towering among the crowded gray roofs in the center of the high-walled Chinese section of the town. The Chinese town is now as it always was. Chinese merchants are the same under any regime. What do they care about politics so long as they are left undisturbed to do business?

As one of the great centers of the South Manchurian Railway, Mukden too has become Japanicized or modernized. Russian influence appears to be limited to chocolate candy and pastry. Chinese are everywhere on the fringes but they are mostly herded in dirty China-towns, in “thieves markets.” The Chinese walled city in Mukden, with its silver shops and crowded window displays, is indeed rather gaudily grand. Distinguished-looking Chinese gentlemen in summer silks drink beer on department store roof-gardens. But the common Chinese in Manchuria is the “coolie” who lives beside the hole in the ground from which was digged the mud to make his poor house. His place is in the bean field behind a crude cultivator

drawn by a cow and a donkey unequally yoked together. But for him there would not be beans for Japan.

For thirty years now Russians and Chinese have been yielding the positions of influence and authority to Japanese. My host in Harbin was a charming Christian gentleman, a Japanese, Vice-Commissioner of Customs. He lives in a spacious home built twenty-five years ago by a Russian for a Chinese customs official. His cook is Chinese, but his two chauffeurs are Russian. He converses with the cook in Chinese and with the chauffeurs in English. English is the commonest medium of exchange among Japanese, Chinese, and Russians, but the Russians are learning Japanese and doubtless the Chinese will learn it too. Bread and butter—or one should say rice—will depend on it.

As the heyday of Russian influence in Harbin has waned, the city has become unkempt. The parks are grown to weeds; the hedges are untidy. Palings have fallen from picket fences. There are no evidences of city pride. "I am disappointed in Harbin," I said to my Japanese friends; "it seems dilapidated and degenerate." "Yes," came the reply, "it will take us about ten years to get it into shape." It is safe to say that unless Harbin is tidied up by the Japanese it will not be tidied up. Not that the usual Japanese modern city is beautiful; it isn't. G. B. Shaw spoke to the point when he told newspaper men in Kobe that the army should bring their guns back from Manchuria and level to the ground the ugly cities of Kobe and Osaka. But the Japanese have a sense of cleanliness and neatness not easily observable elsewhere in Asia, and if it could be discovered in any part of the world today what sort of architecture may now properly be called beautiful, we may be sure that Japanese cities would take advantage of the discovery.

Where the Japanese are there is movement and change—I will not say progress, for the word begs the question.

IV

"Behold, what manner of stones, what manner of buildings!" the startled traveler to Hsingking is likely to exclaim. For the most spectacular of Manchoukuo's building projects is the new capital.

The town, formerly called Changchun, is not so very old. It first came into importance in 1899 as the southern terminus of the Chinese

Eastern Railway, when its population jumped to 70,000. In 1905 Japan took over the railway south of Changchun. The South Manchurian Railway Company was then organized, and in 1910 obtained 5,736 acres of land as the railway zone, in which it built up a considerable city of administration buildings, schools, hotels, paved streets, parks, and recreation grounds. By 1930 the city had attained a population of 90,000, but due to its being made the new capital, there was a phenomenal growth in population, until at the end of 1934 it numbered nearly 230,000, mostly Manchoukuoans, but with Japanese (including Koreans), some Russians and other foreigners. Three years ago there were 10,000 Japanese in Hsingking; now there are nearly 50,000, not including soldiers and others engaged in military affairs.

The houses built by Japanese in Manchuria are very different from the houses in Japan. The commonest form is stucco, often attractively ornamented with stone; all are screened and have central heating, and are far more comfortable than ordinary Japanese houses. Also, since the Japanese in Manchuria are usually in white-collar positions, their houses are of correspondingly high grade. Yet much of Manchuria is distressing to Japanese as a place of residence. Especially is this true of Hsingking, where there are no pine trees nor evergreen shrubs. Imagine Japanese without pine trees! The long winters are drab and desolate. There are no night amusements, except cafes and brothels, which are wide open. Chinese, Japanese, and Korean girls, strangely dressed in Japanese kimonos to attract Japanese men, can be seen by the dozen through the open doors of the brothels thickly placed in the narrow streets. With patriotic spirit the Japanese girls serve in these establishments to comfort their compatriots who in a lonesome land serve the interests of the Empire. "Why are there Korean girls in Japanese brothels, dressed in Japanese garb," I asked my Korean friend. "Because they can be bought more cheaply than Japanese girls," was the answer.

V

The open cut coal mine at Fu-shun is an impressive sight. This field of bituminous coal covers about 16,500 acres, running nearly ten miles from east to west and two and a half miles from north to south. It consists of one gigantic coal seam averaging 130 feet in thickness. The total deposit is estimated at 953,000,000 tons. Since 1907 the Japanese have here been

perfecting their mining methods until the daily production of coal now averages about 20,000 tons. Already a vast canyon has been digged, and it is estimated that it will require yet thirty years to exhaust the mine, when there will have been excavated two and a half times as much material as the quantity of earth removed in digging the Panama Canal.

It is no wonder that the attractive Japanese young woman conductress of our sight-seeing bus, in a smart tailored dress of foreign design, with a head full of figures and statistics, tells us that "Even Americans express amazement at the magnitude of this mine." They do, indeed. And they also express amazement at the ingenuity, energy and power of the South Manchurian Railway, which in addition to all this operates as subsidiary projects an electric plant which supplies power to Mukden, an ammonium sulphate plant, a coke factory, and a shale-oil plant.

The employees at work in the mines are 3,000 Japanese and 30,000 Chinese. It was with manifest pride that our girl guide gave us the latter figure, meaning to suggest that the benevolence of Japanese capitalism was to be discerned in its generosity in permitting the Chinese to dig coal for the South Manchurian Railway Company.

"This vast undertaking," she said, "causes one to think of the greatness of man." It does. But even more it reminds some of us of the greatness of God and of the childishness of man in exploiting as rapidly as possible earth's bounties, like a child devouring a sack of candy.

I will build me a nest on the greatness of God.

VI

The history of Manchuria since 1906 is the history of the South Manchurian Railway Company. The almost sufficient explanation of events of recent years in Manchuria is to be found in the growth of this Company, in its expanding exploitation and control of the natural resources of Manchuria, and in its ever-mounting investments and increasing wealth.

It will not be disputed that the South Manchurian Railway Company in its brief history of under thirty years represents one of the most brilliant and indeed benevolent examples of capitalist economic penetration to be observed anywhere on the face of the earth. We have here one of the most perfect examples of how in modern times an expanding economic penetration, peaceful if you will, and under apparently innocuous treaty rights, ends in the necessity of political control.

Though primarily concerned with its extensive railway undertakings, the Company operates as accessory enterprises—in addition to the coal mines and subsidiary projects already mentioned—railway manufactories, harbors and wharves, warehouses, and hotels. It is a miniature government, administering the Railway Zone. It builds and conducts schools, libraries, museums, hospitals, and various hygienic institutions. It controls joint-stock companies, electric and gas works, shipping and dockyard companies, and several industrial concerns and factories. It carries on a chemical research laboratory, a geological research institute, an economic research committee, and several agricultural experimental stations and farms. The Company is particularly proud of its nonprofit producing activities.

The traveler in Manchuria comes to the conclusion that everything of value there is controlled, owned, or built by the South Manchurian Railway Company. And one does not see how it could be possible for any organization to secure such elaborate economic rights and developments in another country, without eventually gaining political control of that country. Political control really means economic control and economic control means political control. Americans, at least, should have learned this as a result of their own Revolutionary War.

The full political significance of the South Manchurian Railway Company, however, does not appear until one is made aware of the fact (1) That one half of the authorized capital of the Company is held by the Japanese government, the other half being allotted for public subscription. (2) In the second place, the President and the Vice-President of the Company are appointed by the government for a term of five years, the eight directors also being appointed by the government for a term of four years, from among the Company's shareholders holding more than one hundred shares. (3) Thirdly, all the departments of the Railway Zone, except the police, are administered by the Railway Company. The Company is thus responsible for all civil engineering, educational and health projects within the Railway Zone, and has the power to tax the residents for the expenses involved.

Mr. Y. Matsuoka, the new President of the Company, says that "Japan cannot halt its North China operations. The arrow has already left the bow. The progress of these operations will decide the destiny of the Yamato race, its rise or fall in the world situation."

VII

As a study in mental process, no more interesting and informative event has taken place in modern times than the establishment of the new empire, Manchoukuo. The new state has been met with amusement, if not with scorn by the nations of the world. It has been dubbed a "puppet-state," and its Emperor has been designated "so-called." Now, with malice toward none and with charity for all, it must be said that in certain very important respects both of these epithets are true. Mr. Feuchtwanger in *Josephus* has one of his characters say:

"I'll tell you something in confidence. At bottom it's quite unimportant who is Emperor. Of ten political decisions that a man may make, no matter what position he's in, nine are imposed upon him by outward circumstances. And the higher a man stands, the more his freedom of decision is circumscribed. Society is a pyramid, the Emperor is the pyramid's tip, and the whole pyramid keeps on revolving, but it isn't the man at the tip that revolves, but those at the bottom. From all appearances the Emperor acts of his own free will. But his fifty million subjects prescribe his actions. Any other Emperor would have had to act just like Vespasian in nine cases out of ten."²

And it seems equally if not more certain in these modern times that all emperors are "so-called." In the eighteenth century, Mr. Gibbon described the "obvious definition" of a monarchy as that of "a state, in which a single person, by whatsoever name he may be distinguished, is entrusted with the execution of the laws, the management of the revenue, and the command of the army."³ In this "obvious sense," monarchs do not exist today. The power of emperors now is neither economic nor political. They are symbols, mystic bonds of unity, personalizations of national ideals, centers of loyalty, modern survivals of national divinities. Their position is super-governmental. And if one wishes to, one may describe such a position as "so-called," although considering emperors in general, the epithet is a bit malicious, and fails to do justice to the far-reaching mystic significance they may have.

In any case, democrats, especially of the American tradition, are likely to object that whereas it may be tolerable for sentimental reasons to retain an ancient royal dynasty, it is without excuse to create a new one. It savors too much of Alexander the Great's having himself declared a god for

¹ P. 330.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 52.

political purposes. However, perhaps this may depend. At least the Japanese think it does.

What the Japanese (or more accurately, the South Manchurian Railway, aided and abetted by the Kwantung Army) have done is to provide an empire for an emperor. It has seemed providential to them that just when a Manchurian Empire was ready to be born, a *real* Manchurian Emperor should be idle and available for a position in his own ancestral land. From this point of view Pu-yi is as real as any emperor can be.

It should also be said that the lonesomeness of Japan in the modern world has made it easier for many of her people to believe in the reality of the Emperor of Manchoukuo. For years democracy has been the popular political ideal of modern youth, and the school teachers have been kept busy insisting in the children's ears that that which gives Japan pre-eminence over the nations of the world is the fact of her Imperial House. But the very intensity with which the need for such insistence is felt is itself evidence of anxiety and the sense of being alone. And lonesomeness is very painful to Japanese. Hence it was with sincere delight that many could hail a neighboring Emperor on his visit to Japan in the spring of 1935, as an equal of their own august sovereign. It suggested that emperors were coming into fashion again and were the normal thing; and thus in the minds of the people the foundations of their own Imperial House were strengthened. It may be that Japan was lifting herself by her own bootstraps, but lift herself she did.

At this point, then, one need not impugn the sincerity of many Japanese. There are yet many people who believe that the most important thing about an Emperor is blood. Dickens' Miss Mowcher did not greatly exaggerate when she affirmed that the whole system of society "is a system of Prince's nails." In any case, many Japanese believe sincerely what they wish to believe about Pu-yi, and by the very intensity of their faith they are striving to make true what they hope will be true in regard to him.

As to the "puppet-state" itself more must be said. I do not see any convincing way to show a Westerner that Manchoukuo is an independent state, nor am I certain to what extent Japanese themselves regard it as independent, or even wish it to be. The Oriental has a strange way of shifting about the nominal and the real as if they were stage-settings. He may treat the nominal as the real and the real as the nominal in such a way as to create only consternation in the mind of the Westerner and evoke the

charges of duplicity, hypocrisy, and pretense. And even when the Westerner thinks he understands this Oriental method of dealing with truth—and factual—values, he cannot *feel* it as the Oriental appears to do. The Oriental, it seems to him, *makes* his truth and his facts; he does not discover them. They have no objective existence prior to and out of relation to him. To assert that something is true or exists is to say that it is true or exists in the sense *he has in mind or will determine*. This seems to the Westerner a very slippery way of handling values, *and it is*. But it must not be set down as mere moral obtuseness on the part of the Oriental. There is some reason in it, and we are obligated to try to understand it.

The problem appears in one of its most difficult forms in relation to the foundation of Manchoukuo. The official language, which has been repeated *ad nauseam*, is to the effect that "on March 9, 1932, Manchoukuo was established by the voluntary (spontaneous, unanimous, etc.) will of the 30,000,000 inhabitants of the country." "On March 1, 1934, the then Chief Executive Pu-yi, accepting the heavenly mandate, graciously acceded to the throne of Manchoukuo as her first Emperor." Again we are told that "Japan took the lead on all other nations in recognizing Manchoukuo in September, 1932."

Now every informed Japanese must know that in the simple sense none of these statements is true. The 30,000,000 inhabitants of Manchuria had nothing to do with the establishment of Manchoukuo. They have no "spontaneous will." They are mostly ignorant Shantung Chinese, hardly better informed than the people of Jonah's Nineveh. At least 90 per cent are said by Japanese authorities to be illiterate. Prosaically speaking, Chief Executive Pu-yi's "heavenly mandate" came from the Kwantung Army. The expression is merely traditional Chinese phraseology in reference to the rule of the Son of Heaven. And the statement that Japan was the first nation to recognize Manchoukuo puts her in the position of talking to herself in a mirror and supposing the image to be another person. Are we to conclude then that the Japanese official propagandists are simply liars, and let it go at that? Well, perhaps so. Yet a more honorable construction is possible.

The Oriental is not accustomed to straight pathways, whether to his house or elsewhere. His approach to life is oblique. What he says, therefore, need not be taken literally. Through years of experience Orientals have learned how to make the proper adjustments in the interpretation of

each other's language, but the Westerner is put at the distressing disadvantage of not knowing when to believe and when not to believe. The Oriental has his reasons for saying what he says. He speaks with a purpose. And often the purpose is not merely to convey neutral information: rather the word in his mind may be pre-eminently of creative rather than of descriptive import. The word which goeth forth out of his mouth, he believes, shall not return unto him void, but shall accomplish that which he pleases and shall prosper in the thing whereto he sends it.

Readers of Mr. Hardy will remember how in *The Mayor of Casterbridge*, Henchard, by a ruse, gets the imprecatory One Hundred Ninth Psalm sung on Mr. Farfrae with the surest certainty of revenge: the very utterance of the curse itself assures its realization. This belief in the power of the word is both ancient and Oriental. A word when spoken by proper authority moves of its own momentum toward the realization of the thing. Here is indeed a kind of pre-Jamesian pragmatism. Truth and existence are not finished somewhats, but something you share in making. By saying a thing *is* so, you help to make it so. By stating as a fact what you wish to be a fact, you thereby help to make it a fact. When you say that something *is*, you mean that it *ought to be*, and therefore *must be*, and therefore *will be*, and therefore *is*. By your word you weight the scales of futurity and determine it.

When Japanese speak of the "spontaneous will of 30,000,000 inhabitants," they are speaking proleptically. They are expressing their faith in terms of the substance of things hoped for. They are describing as already existing a situation they ardently desire. When the thirty million inhabitants of Manchuria *have* a will, they mean to say, this is what it will be. This is the spontaneous will the thirty million, by the grace of Japan, are destined to have.

Likewise the idea that the powers that be are ordained of God has had an ancient and honorable history. The idea is thoroughly Oriental, although certain important strains of Chinese thought have been opposed to it. Rulers are *ipso facto* Sons of Heaven. The fact that the powers *are*, is for most people sufficient evidence of their divine ordination. And if the South Manchurian Railway Company and the Kwantung Army are not mentioned, this is in order that, in the words of a third-century Christian anti-heretical writer, the common people may not "lose sight of heaven while they are employed in measuring the earth." The "Heavenly Man-

date" idea is not meant to suggest the absence of the human, but its unimportance. This is a thoroughly religious form of expression, and in part is what is meant when the East is described as "spiritual." Every Japanese is aware that the Kwantung Army is the prop behind the new Emperor, without which he could not stand. But they mean to keep him on his feet until he *can* stand—but do they really wish him to stand alone?

Japan is sincerely determined to make Manchoukuo an independent state, *in certain respects*. It is true that the Japanese are the real managers of the country; it is true that the new capital at Hsinking, with its 60-meter-wide boulevard, its mammoth administration buildings, is being laid out and built by Japanese architects and if not by Japanese money at least by money which has been obtained by Japanese management. And yet the Japanese will be glad when the government of Manchoukuo can bear its own burdens. Japan wants Manchoukuo to be independent *up to that point where independence will relieve Japan of annoying problems or be of positive value from the economic or military point of view*. By excluding Russia and China from Manchuria Japan has assured for herself the economic and military dominance of the country. And the independence which she affirms for the new state is not interpreted to exclude this dominance and control.

VIII

Only an economic or social radical has a moral right to object to Japan's activities in Manchuria. The European who assumes the legitimacy of the nineteenth-century method of creating national wealth by having recourse to the colonization of hitherto undeveloped areas of the earth's surface; the American who has been bred in the traditional prospecting and pioneering point of view, and who hopes to make easy money by moving westward to unoccupied lands, whether of oil or gold or what-not; who is ready to exploit any natural resource or any unmet public need for his own profit—such people have no right to criticize Japan. Japan's methods of exploitation are quite as benevolent as those of any other country. Japanese government is orderly to a fault. The twenty million Chinese who have immigrated into Manchuria during the last thirty years have come because they were certain of a better and more secure living under Japanese forms of exploitation than under those of war lords, glorified bandits. The Japanese will not tolerate bandits in Manchuria any more

than they would tolerate them in their own country or than they would tolerate pirates on their seas. The way of the transgressor—that is, of certain kinds—is hard in Japan. Let there be no mistake about that.

This is not the place to elaborate on the benefits of Japanese rule, nor to point out its defects. But anyone who lives in Japan knows that Japan is one of the best-governed countries in the world. As peoples go, the Japanese are a law-abiding people. In Japan one lives in quiet and security. And one could easily make out a case that Manchuria is far better off under Japanese rule than under misgovernment by war lords, or any looser form of government which might be administered by China. But to justify Japan in Manchuria (or in Korea, for that matter) because of her ability to govern and “civilize” is to permit the good to make impossible the realization of the best, and is to overlook the more essential moral facts in accordance with which alone a stable social order can be achieved:

(1) No group of people has a moral right to dominate the life of another group, economically, politically, or otherwise. And so long as the South Manchurian Railway Company stock is owned by Japan and the Japanese, this domination will exist, no matter to what extent Japan yields to Manchoukuo its extraterritorial rights.

(2) The method of solution of local economic problems by recourse to the colonization and exploitation of less highly mechanized or civilized portions of the earth's surface is essentially immoral because (a) it degrades the peoples of the lands it exploits; even though it may raise their economic standards it destroys their self-respect and makes permanent the stigma according to which they are regarded by others as an inferior people. “In the act of making himself a master, the soldier helps create a race of slaves.”* (b) It induces the spirit of pride in the dominant group, which blinds its eyes to essential moral values. Pride or vainglory is one of the most perilous attitudes. It goeth before destruction because it induces it by making true understanding impossible. (c) *It brings no permanent solution of economic problems, and therefore is really futile.*

Kyrie Eleison.

* Lewis Mumford, *Technics and Civilization*, p. 95.

What Should I Read?

R. BIRCH HOYLE

THE above question was recently sent to me by a Lutheran Ministers' Meeting as a topic upon which to address them. On cross-examination it was found that most of the ministers were scarcely reading serious theological literature at all. They had little time for it, what with so many meetings to get ready for, so much going to and fro, conferences to attend, and the hundred and one calls on a parson's weekly time. I was tempted to give the reply the present Archbishop of York's father gave to a London vicar, who pleaded that he had no time: "You have all the time there is!"

I had to say that anything I could suggest must depend upon what they most liked to read and had read. Like the physician called in to see a sick patient, a diagnosis had to be made and the usual diet ascertained before one could prescribe. It was found that the summer vacation was the best time they had for "catching up" with current thought, that a few books were packed up with the baggage, but opened, it must be confessed, only when rainy days came. One recalled how Doctors Westcott and Hort took hundredweights of books with them when on vacation, the fruits of which we have in their Greek Testament; how Dr. R. W. Dale usually surveyed the sermon topics he had dealt with during the preceding year, so that neglected themes should get their chance, as becomes one whose duty is "rightly dividing the word of truth"; how, so Dame Rumor said, Dr. A. E. Garvie, when a Congregational pastor in Scotland, made a year's sermons in advance, when on holiday, so as to read nothing but solid divinity during the next eleven months!

The editor of *RELIGION IN LIFE* has suggested to me that I write upon what I consider to be the best books of the past year or so that have come my way as a reviewer of theological literature. The aim of this paper is to guide a minister to books that may be profitably "chewed and digested," as Bacon of Verulam said some ought to be, during the summer vacation. This is a ticklish business, for tastes differ, and "one man's meat is another man's poison." But, as Emil Brunner laid it down in his Preface to *The Mediator*, it is the duty of the theologian to "examine the spiritual

'food values' of the faith which the Church offers to the world . . . to distinguish the true from the false: the Church needs to use theology as a check, in order to protect herself against 'food poisoning,' and against the acceptance of worthless and deceptive 'food substitutes.' " Those words aptly prescribe one duty a reviewer has to discharge.

BIBLICAL EXPOSITION

At once, let it be said, sermons, and tips for sermons, will not be noticed. Rather, great subjects, out of which suggestions for pulpit discourses may spring forth, will command attention. The greatest subject of all is the Word of God. It is to be feared that the Bible is not as much read or expounded as a former generation handled it. The two foremost Free Church preachers of that generation in England, Alexander Maclaren and Joseph Parker, were first and last expositors. The two present-day preachers in London who have the largest congregations, Dinsdale Young and G. Campbell Morgan, are pre-eminently expositors of the Holy Writ. The two foremost Swiss-German preachers of today, Karl Barth and Eduard Thurneysen, keep strictly to exposition. When they are to preach in Basle Minister, the seats are filled to capacity an hour before the service commences. Barth, and rightly, is regarded more as a theologian than a preacher. But all ministers should heed some of his remarks when taking farewell of his students in Bonn. He said, "I shall not deny that, humanly, I have pursued dogmatics with a certain pleasure and love. But now, I counsel you, take up your study anew in some other quarter. Let this be my last counsel. Exegesis, exegesis. And once more, exegesis! If I have become a *Dogmatiker* it is because for long I have toiled in pursuit of exegesis. . . . Hold you on to the Word, the Scripture, and become perhaps less systematic than biblical theologians." To those who cannot read German, one can commend the translations by Doctor Homrighausen and others of the volumes, *God's Search for Man* and *God in Action*. In the latter book a splendid example of exposition is given of the Pastoral Epistles, in the address on "The Ministry of the Word of God."

The charm of two other recent books lies partly in their power to expound Scripture. The reference is to J. A. Findlay's *A Portrait of Peter*, where a running comment on First Peter is given which may serve as a model by which a minister may take his people through a whole book, instead of using snippety texts. The other book is Wilfrid L. Hannam's

Luke, the Evangelist. We cannot have too many books bearing that stamp. Thirty years after Dr. A. M. Fairbairn left Aberdeen, Scotland, men and women recalled his exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews; so, too, Doctor Dale's exposition of the same book, and of James, molded men of Birmingham, while the late Bishop (then Canon) Gore filled Westminster Abbey on week-days when expounding Acts and the Sermon on the Mount. "There were giants in those days."

Several good books, issued this past year, take the reader through Scripture as a whole. One, *The Modern Approach to the Old Testament*, is by J. C. Townsend; another is *The Hebrew Heritage*, by C. W. Harris; a third is *The Religion of the Hebrews*, by C. Ryder Smith. On the New Testament as a whole, Mrs. Lyman's *The Christian Epic*, just issued, may enable the minister to see better the "setting" or "milieu," in which this varied literature arose out of life. These volumes supply just the material for use in giving youth societies a "background," so pitifully scanty, if we may judge by the theological students entering our seminaries today. If a minister seeks guidance to preach on Old-Testament prophets, *The Prophets of Israel*, by H. Cook, will show him how well it can be done.

The New Testament, however, has a stronger claim on a minister. The Life of Jesus, our Lord's, can be approached from a new angle if the trilogy by the Russian man of letters, D. Merezhkowski, is put in one's bag. Scribner's have packed the trilogy into two volumes. *Jesus, the Unknown* appeared a year or two ago; now, with the title, *Jesus Manifest*, the books on *The Public Ministry* and *The Passion* are gathered into one volume. This famous writer of genius transports us across the centuries to Palestine. With the use of a library of books as basis, his own travels in the Holy Land to give color, and a poet's imagination to impart fire and light, the Russian expresses the profound impression the gospel story has made on his devout soul. Another brilliant piece of work comes from the pen of C. H. Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom*, a book worthy to rank with the same writer's exposition of Romans in the Moffatt Commentaries. The eschatological problem of Jesus' teaching on the Kingdom looms large in current European thinking. Nor must one overlook the book, *The Bible and the Greeks*, by the same author. Rudolf Otto's latest book still awaits translation: its title (in English) is *Kingdom of God and Son of Man*. When it comes out in English it will, in all probability, deeply influence scholars.

"Form-Criticism"—the latest vogue—is meeting with a mixed reception. J. A. Findlay has little praise for it; Bishop Headlam, too, cannot find much use for it. Yet some lectures by N. Dibelius, *Gospel Criticism and Christology*, apply constructively the ideas expressed in the same writer's *From Tradition to Gospel*, which has been translated this past year. The theologian will find much grist for his mill in the first of these two works.

DIVINE PHILOSOPHY

The past year has produced a crop of first-rate books seeking to give a philosophical background for Christian thought. Half a dozen books, each one of which would have made an *annus mirabilis*, have appeared. Archbishop Temple's *Nature, Man and God* is a great book in which to lay the foundations of one's mind. Another Anglican, the new Dean of Saint Paul's, London, Dr. W. R. Matthews, in *The Purpose of God*, brings the Argument from Design abreast of the current views of the world, and makes a powerful apologetic for human freedom within God's purpose to redeem mankind. The theme of Human Freedom is taken up by the Russian, Berdyaev, in *Freedom and the Spirit* (Scribner's), a work highly esteemed by leading thinkers. But be warned: this is not easy reading! Professor H. H. Farmer, a pupil and successor to John Oman, has given us a beautiful book, *The World and God*. Ministers will find here plenty of sound, devout thinking on the difficult problems of Prayer, Miracle and Providence. The clear manner of presentation, the noble insistence on Christian experience, bold and unafraid of all that scientists may say, deep insight into the difference to thought and life that comes when sin is forgiven—these things make it a means of grace as well as a feast for the mind of the reader.

The influential German theologian, Karl Heim, is coming into prominence in English-speaking lands. Professor Daniel Lamont, of Edinburgh, mediates some of Heim's seminal ideas in *Christ and the World of Thought*; Professor Farmer, too, makes much use of Heim. Now Heim's first volume of his *magnum opus* is to be read in English: *God Transcendent*. Some of his addresses, more of a devotional than a philosophical character, are available in *The Church of Christ and Problems of the Day*. These were delivered in America a year ago. Anything Heim says is helpful, so beautiful is his writing, so rich are his illustrations, so devout his spirit.

BOOKS ON THEOLOGY

A welcome feature is the appearance of books dealing with theology proper. Within recent weeks the long-awaited translation of Karl Barth's *Doctrine of the Word of God*, skillfully done into English by Professor Thomson of Aberdeen, has been issued (T. and T. Clark). The preacher worthy of his salt will have it constantly within reach. It is a massive study of the material, manner, and perennial message of the preacher's calling. The book is in two large sections, the first taking up, by way of Prolegomena, these themes: "Church Preaching, or the Material of Dogmatics," "The Word of God in Its Threefold Form," "The Nature of the Word of God," "How the Word of God Is Known." The second part of this large volume discusses The Revelation of God, as Trinity, as Father, Son and Holy Ghost. Stupendous toil has been exercised in this great work, for the greatest theologians of twenty centuries have been laid under contribution. In this way the treasure-trove of vast libraries is put at the disposal of the working pastor—treasure within the reach of only those with great libraries near by. The style, too, is clearer than the enigmatic style of the famous *Romans*, which made Barth famous. Alexander Whyte used to bid men sell their beds to get good books: this is one he would wholeheartedly have commended.

What is meant by Revelation—"the Person of God speaking to the soul"—is prominent now, and a book by E. F. Scott, on *The New Testament Idea of Revelation*, makes a useful introduction to Barth's titanic volume. Another valuable book on Revelation, hardly known in America, is by Archdeacon Lilley, *Religion and Revelation*, being the Paddock Lectures for 1931. (S. P. C. K.)

Two good books on the doctrine of God have been issued in the new series of "Studies in Theology" Duckworth is producing. One is by Dr. Maldwyn Hughes, *The Christian Idea of God*. His chapter on "The Sovereign Fatherhood of God," with emphasis on "Sovereign," captures some of Barth's force. Dr. W. B. Selbie has written the other book, *The Fatherhood of God*. It is a book to make a man "sit up." Jesus, he holds, did not teach a universal Fatherhood: "The distinctive factor in Christianity is not that Jesus thought that God was the Father of men, but that God was *His* Father." In both of these books we have a firm handling of the difficulties attaching to the doctrine of the Trinity. And these books can be carried easily in one's pocket for perusal out of doors.

The atonement is being discussed more and more in these days. Since Brunner's *The Mediator* was published, we have had Bishop Aulen's book, *Christus Victor*, which puts in a plea for what he calls "The Classical Doctrine," which presents Christ as Victor over sin, death, hell and the devil. This classical view was restored by Luther—Aulen is a Lutheran—and keeps God right through the whole process of atonement, whereas other theories, the Latin of Anselm, the moral of Abelard, have their defects. Following upon Aulen, we have R. S. Franks' Dale Lectures—which would almost make Dale rise from the grave. Franks is an Abelardian; he attacks Barth and Brunner hip and thigh for upholding divine sovereignty; he cannot tolerate any action of God that does not appeal to his reason. *The Atonement*—the title of his book—does present a doctrine that can be preached, but there are phases Franks' reason cannot fathom. Hard upon Franks comes Bishop Headlam with a book of the same title. He, too, is impatient with Brunner's "expiatory, substitutionary theory" that "Jesus paid the debt." The Bishop inclines to the Abelardian theory, that Christ exhibits God's love by dying on the cross, such love creating love in the sinner. To quote the Bishop's own words, "Christ was victorious over evil on the cross because the only power that can triumph over evil is love. . . . The atonement through Christ was the revelation through the cross, and in no other way could it be accomplished save by the sacrifice of love and obedience as a revelation of the nature of God." . . . (pp. 190, 191).

Two other books on the atonement have come to hand since then. Campbell N. Moody's book, *Christ For Us and In Us*, is reverently written and brings out, as few books on the atonement do, the work of the Holy Spirit in "making man penitent" and opening man's eyes to see what Calvary means. Where Headlam stresses a "refined Humanism," "synergism," Moody emphasizes the need for the Spirit's work in (to use a phrase of Barth's) "opening up man's nature to receive God." "The only true repentance," says Moody, "is something miraculous, not brought about apart from the death of Christ, His resurrection and exaltation, and the gift of the Holy Spirit which He sent down."

The other book is by Dr. W. Russell Maltby, *Christ and His Cross*. He brings forward aspects which are only too easily passed by in the so-called Abelardian theory. "It does not sufficiently consider the nature of that burden which was laid upon One whose character and office it was to

recover men from sin to God. Further, sin and its forgiveness do not appear in these theories to be the desperate problem which the New Testament and the deepest Christian experience declare them to be." He quotes Doctor Dale's saying: "God does not redeem us merely by revealing His love. He reveals His love by redeeming us."

It is a healthy sign, presaging spiritual rebirth and vigor, when the Church turns again to consider her Redeemer and from what she is redeemed. The increasing attention given to the meaning of the atonement by leading scholars is a call to ministers to preach on it more and more. One book on this theme, at the very least, should go with the minister on vacation.

THE CHURCH AND THE WORLD

In all probability many ministers will seek to get away from this vexing problem, namely, how the Church, being in the world, shall be not of the world, and how she may hope to capture the world for Christ by using "other-worldly" means. Although a long list of books has been published on this problem, it has to be admitted that, as yet, little guidance of a practicable nature seems to be given. The rise of secular states, claiming that supreme devotion to the State is the first duty of citizens, raises the age-long question as to the relation, in God's sight, of Church and State. The problem becomes practical when the State demands military service from its able-bodied citizens. Then the seeming opposition of modern competitive commerce with the Sermon on the Mount becomes a problem. Readers of this Quarterly are well acquainted with these and kindred problems. What literature is helpful here?

Three or four books by Americans may be cited. Your reviewer must confess that he finds more heat than light in Stanley Jones's *Christ's Alternative to Communism*. The actuality of conflict is forcefully presented, but the solution appears, to his mind, inconclusive. Even Karl Heim's essay on "Christ, His Church and the World" (No. 5 in *The Church of Christ and the Problems of the Day*), with its emphasis on the need for a Leader in the spiritual sphere, hardly comes to grips with the problem of ethicizing great corporations, like the State, the huge trusts, which, like a huge web, entangle our little lives. How much heed do statesmen give to the Church's voice? Has the Church of Christ *one voice*? The two services Heim mentions, acting as a nation's conscience, doing ambulance work for

the victims of competitive industry, do not get to the causes of the world's malaise. If the essays of H. Richard Niebuhr, Wilhelm Pauck and Francis Miller, in *The Church Against the World*, are any measure of the situation, the Church is too much like the "world" to have much converting power. "The Question of the Church," it is said, "is not how it can measure up to the expectations of society nor what it must do to become a savior of civilization, but rather how it can be true to itself; that is, to its Head. What must it do to be saved?" It is averred that "the Church has adjusted itself too much rather than too little to the world in which it lives. It has identified itself too intimately with capitalism, with the philosophy of individualism, and with the imperialism of the West." The practical duty, according to these writers, is "to recreate among the members [of the American Protestant Church] belief in the reality of Christendom. That means pre-occupation with those elements in the Christian faith that have an absolute and eternal value." The demand is to regain "a Christian theology." "Theology must take the place of psychology and sociology." Professor Halford Luccock, in his brilliantly written book, *Christian Faith and Economic Change*, as the title indicates, is not bothering so much about Church and State as about "the economic and social situation." He is concerned about "recording the conviction that a vigorous and unprejudiced analysis of our economic system will show that if a gospel of love is to be adequately implemented in such a world as ours, the implements required include the social ownership and control of the principal means of production. Nothing less can provide an order of life which will provide a secure basis for the welfare of a whole population or deserve the name 'Christian.'" He quite clearly perceives what a revolution this implies: he recognizes "that a necessary preliminary to any real progress to a socialized order is the creation of the desire for it and the willingness to pay the price," and that "the first concern of evangelism must be the conviction of sin." But his closing word is "to get a touch of madness"; "the touch of madness is the ultimate credential of a genuine Christianity." Now, while allowing for the genuine passion for a change, there is little help or guidance in that bit of rhetoric. Rather we need a thorough examination into the various factors involved, and that must be with cool minds and sane, balanced judgment.

Such a balanced weighing of the factors is to be found in two books, *The Christian Social Tradition*, by R. Tribe (S. P. C. K.), and Dr. A. E.

Garvie's *The Fatherly Rule of God* (Abingdon Press). The former book gives a history of the social tradition which covers the social teaching of Judaism and that of the Christian Church to the end of the Middle Ages. This is followed by a presentation of the theology on which a Christian sociology is based, and some of the ultimate Christian sociological principles are outlined. Under *Modern Problems* we have the Church's reaction to politics and economics described, under which are included pacificism and war, the family, education and use of leisure, and finally, international relations.

What is wanted, so Mr. Tribe thinks, is a co-operation between the moralist and the economist. "To obtain that co-operation we need theologians who know economics and economists who know and have thought out what Christianity means. At the present time there is a fatal gap between theology and economics."

He has sensible suggestions to make with reference to what the Church as a body can do; what directors, managers can do when economic decisions have to be made; what individuals can do as purchasers, and how public opinion may be informed. But there is no talk of "madness."

Better still is Doctor Garvie's little, yet big, book. Its subtitle is "A Study of Society, State, and Church." He starts where statesmen and economists seldom start, namely, at the relation of God to man. That is, there must be a theological, religious foundation upon which social life must be erected. From that basis he marshals the arguments that show "the necessity and the nature of society." All phases of this complicated theme get thorough judicial examination. He advances to a consideration of the functions of the State, as the organ of a nation, its economic, educational and cultural functions. To this is added a chapter on the Church's mission, with an acute discussion of the relations of Church and State, in past centuries and today in Europe. All phases of tension and conflict come up for review; even the problems of the authority of conscience. In this book we have the sober reflections of one whose survey of facts and factors is thorough, of one whose judgments are pervaded with a deep sense of religion. There is little rhetoric in these pages; downright good common sense is here, which level-headed men of sense will value. This book slips easily into one's pocket: take it when on vacation.

It is instructive to note how a Roman Catholic layman, Mr. Christopher Dawson, when writing on *Religion and the Modern State*, is in all

essentials in agreement with the Congregationalist, Doctor Garvie. Mr. Dawson says, "It would be of little profit to get the world to accept Christian economic principles when it does not accept Christian intellectual and moral principles." And some American advocates might heed, with profit, these words, "If we believe that the kingdom of heaven can be established by political and economic measures—that it can be an earthly State—then we can hardly object to the claims of such a State to embrace the whole of life, and to demand the total submission of the individual will and conscience."

If one wants to study the affinities and disagreements of Communism and Christianity, get two books which supplement each other, one, *Creative Society*, by John Macmurray, and H. G. Wood's *Communism, Christian and Marxist*. We have not space to describe the contents of these: enough to say that Professor Macmurray leans hard to Communism, while Mr. Wood is quite sure that the Marxist ideal and that of Christianity are opposed to one another. We ought to hear both sides of a case, always.

The average minister may feel embarrassed after the reading of this list of books worthy to be read. Let him, however, select what he thinks will help him, according to his penchant. One thing will strike him, that we need to get back to God, to lay ourselves open to His Spirit, "who announces coming things," for which a minister needs to be prepared. One other book he may well use, Henry Van Dusen's *God in These Times*. This young theologian has much wise counsel to give on all the problems touched upon in this survey of the leading theological and religious books of the past year. But above all, let the Bible be studied with an eye to our present problems and it will be found that the key to their solution lies there, in the hands of the Loving Father, who is the Controller of all human destiny.

A German View of Church and State

CLARENCE TUCKER CRAIG

IN view of the ecumenical interest in the relationship of Church to the State, a volume by a representative German theologian on *Germany within the Religious Situation of the World*¹ is of particular importance. The author, Heinrich Frick, is the successor to Rudolph Otto at Marburg, the one theological faculty in the third *Reich* which issued a united protest against the Aryan clause. He belongs neither to the German Christian party nor to the extreme confessional groups now fighting the Nazi church policy. His teaching experience and lecture tours in this country have given him wide knowledge of our religious situation. This makes his deliberate rejection for Germany of the American approach to the problem of particular interest.

Though the issue is set in a world-wide perspective, the real purpose of Doctor Frick is to offer a compromise which may under-cut the apparently hopeless differences between certain ecclesiastical groups in Germany and the Nazi state. We may pass over, therefore, the chapter on the geography of religions, which deals with the continental "Inner Crescent" within which the great missionary religions have arisen, Christianity moving westward and Buddhism eastward. As far as the thesis of the book is concerned, the main purpose of the chapter is to show that Russia and the United States both lie outside this territory and face different situations.

In Russia, the government is *hostile* to religion. Moscow has become a center for the propagation of godlessness. While atheism is not new in our time, it has a new confidence. For Calvin, belief in God was *extra controversiam*. For many today, the denial of God has the same self-evident character. The way which Russia offers to Germany is that of "No religion; only culture." While there are passages in which Frick notes other aspects of Communism—"the message of Marx is a secularizing of the Christian message of the coming kingdom of God"—it is assumed to be identical with the denial of religion. If Germany should adopt Com-

¹ *Deutschland innerhalb der religiösen Weltlage*. By Heinrich Frick. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann. \$1.80.

munism, she would turn her back upon her religious heritage and become a cultural appendage of Russia.

In our country, the State is avowedly *neutral* toward religion. We have become so accustomed to the assumption that a free Church within a secular State is the ultimate solution of the problem that it comes as a shock to have it deliberately rejected and on the basis of the results seen in this country. He points to the lack of religious training in the lives of masses of our people. Complete religious freedom means in practice a divided and powerless Protestantism. The intense German individualism would make it worse for them. Separation would do far more harm than good. He believes that the State should specifically affirm religion, for it is an essential part of culture, but leave complete freedom of conscience to the *individual* in his confession of faith.

If the State is to *affirm* religion, if culture is to be with religion and not in denial of it, *what* religion is to be favored? The author deals at this point with the new concern with non-Christian faiths. He reminds us that neither the first Christian missionaries nor Luther had even heard of Buddha. Today for the first time there is a consciousness within Christendom of other high religions. While primitive cultures have collapsed before the missionary movement, advanced religions have given way very little before Christianity. But Frick is primarily concerned with the German Faith Movement, the attempt to develop an Aryan religion that will not be embarrassed with Jewish scriptures. He points to the failure in Japan of a revived national religion (Shintoism) to oust a high universal religion (Buddhism). But the German ethnic faith has no such continuous tradition as Shintoism. When Frick later in the volume develops his statement of a religious educational program on the basis of five points taken from Goethe, he is not forgetful of the fact that the German Faith Movement has claimed Goethe as one of her prophets. The recent resignation of Hauer, the leader of the movement, probably indicates its decreasing importance within Germany and for us this phase of the argument is of less immediate interest.

For Frick, then, the religion to be affirmed is Christianity. It is *the Way*. He sees the differential between it and other thought currents in *eschatology*. The Utopian *diesseits* eschatology of Communism is branded as "horribly primitive." Vitalism, as seen in the German Faith Movement and elsewhere, holds to an optimistic belief in progress, or a tragic heroism

in the face of new defeats, or busies itself with the Eternal in the individual man. Much average Christianity has forsaken the Bible for a mystical individualism. But for Frick belief in the biblical "last day" is more scientific than any spatial *jenseits*. The Christian way calls in question the optimism of the deed and proclaims that salvation is "not of this world." All that we can do is to erect *signs* of its rule as we wait for the coming kingdom of God.

The peculiar aspect of the German situation is that both Catholic and Protestant confessions are found there in comparable strength. Frick sees the vital point of distinction in the *conception of the Church*. The root of much of the strife within German Protestantism lies in the failure to keep free from the Roman Catholic conception. For Catholicism, the Church is a world-embracing institution whose ideal is a unitary culture. It is an institution of divine origin which stands opposed to the State. Relations with the national State are governed by a concordat drawn up between the two. When Protestant churches seek such arrangements, as they have often done in Germany since the war, they are really going back to the Catholic conception of the Church.

For the true Protestant, the Church is *invisible*. No legally constituted organization can be the body of Christ or the kingdom of God. The Church of faith is and remains invisible. While the cult community may be a visible body of people receiving the sacraments and hearing the word, the true Church is always invisible, for faith cannot be seen. While Frick is more sympathetic toward an "activist" faith than many Germans of today, he looks upon the attempt to build an earthly kingdom of God in a combination of Church and culture as a rejection of the mission of giving witness against all culture. The world of culture belongs to God's fallen creation. Culture—even ecclesiastical organizations—is of the world. The Protestant lives in a daily tension between a criticism of all culture, and unreserved solidarity with his own national culture. Frick quotes with approval the position of Sohm that the greatest accomplishment of the Reformation, apart from the rediscovery of the gospel, was the secularization of culture. The idea of a Christian culture is "Catholicism." Hence, the problem of Church and State as we usually understand it simply disappears. The real tension is between national solidarity and our witness to the gospel. "The visible evangelical church bodies as religious structures of culture stand under the authority of the State. As long as the

State leaves untouched the signs of the invisible Church—the announcement in word and sacrament—the evangelical churches have the duty of obedience and service to the State.” No State can exercise control over the “body of Christ,” for that is invisible.

The *corpus Christianum* in Luther’s sense has broken down in the modern world. Individual freedom of conscience has come to stay. But the religious-affirming State should exercise a *diaconate* in three spheres—financial support, maintenance of theological faculties, and obligatory elementary religious instruction. This American reader believes that every one of these is perilous for the freedom of religion. But we must grant to Doctor Frick that German history has heretofore followed the course he supports. It is the groups in Germany who advocate a radical separation of Church and State who are promulgating what is new and radical for them. To the extreme confessional groups he is trying to say that their position is not true to Luther. To the German Christians he is saying that the critique of all culture, which is essential to the gospel, should be held fast.

Certain questions inevitably come to mind. Is the gospel inextricable from the original Jewish eschatology? Can the freedom of the gospel be maintained when the Church organizations are “co-ordinated” to the State, even though the Church of faith is invisible? How can a State which has fomented racial discrimination and persecution teach through its schools even the elements of the gospel? Frick might ask if the attitudes of some American churches toward the Negro disqualified them from being institutions in which the gospel may be taught. More likely he would insist that there is no alternative but a system which would leave the great mass without any fundamental religious teaching upon which the minister could build. The proposals which he makes for Germany are as impossible for us as he believes our position is for Germany. But before we condemn it in principle, we should ask ourselves what hope we can have that the masses of our people may have sufficient knowledge of religion to decide for or against faith in any intelligent way. In any case, no one has a right to champion the cause of the confessional groups in Germany as the *only* Christian position until he has made a sympathetic attempt to evaluate the case which Doctor Frick presents.

Book Reviews

The Last Puritan. By GEORGE SANTAYANA. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. \$2.75.

THE literary event of the year is this novel by Santayana. Known for over forty years to a restricted circle as a writer of great style and distinction in the field of philosophy, with occasional excursions into poetry, he has suddenly, no doubt to his own amazement, become a popular figure.

This novel, if truth were told, is not a novel. It is philosophy dramatized. All characters speak the language of the author and differ only in their embodiment of alternative views and ways of life. It is a long and constantly charming Platonic dialogue set into the modern world. External events never meant much to Santayana, in spite of his being an avowed naturalist and materialist (with him these terms lose their starkness and are transmuted into almost poetical conceptions). It is the inner life, its aspirations and musings that have always attracted him most and in the description of which he must be recognized as a master. Oliver Alden, the young hero, born to wealth and family in Connecticut, educated at Williams and Harvard, was in life a real person, in fact one of Santayana's best students of philosophy before Santayana, Latin to the core, had fled from the, to him, uncongenial and cramping life at Harvard to a retired life at first in London and Paris, and now in Rome. As in Dante's *Divine Comedy*, Virgil, Beatrice, and Dante, though real, also become characters in a rich and recondite allegory, so here. Oliver Alden becomes

the representative of Puritanism about to disappear.

The most remarkable thing about the whole undertaking is that Santayana attempts to draw sympathetically an attitude to life which had always been alien to him. To religion (as poetry) Santayana has always been attracted; to him it ever was "the head and front of everything." But his attitude to Protestantism and Puritanism had been unperceptive and sometimes even harsh. Brought up in the Catholic tradition, he could not understand the blend "of earnestness and subjective waywardness" in Protestantism. To James, who gently chided him for his impertinent airs, he once wrote in self-defence: "I wonder if you realize the years of suppressed irritation which I have passed in the midst of an unintelligible, sanctimonious and often disingenuous Protestantism, which is thoroughly alien and repulsive to me." Now, however, at the age of more than seventy, there has come greater understanding and sympathy.

The Puritanism of the hero, it must be borne in mind, is freed from fanaticism and hardness. Of Oliver his Latin cousin could say: "When was there ever such sweetness and such integrity!" The essential characteristic of this Puritanism is the high resolve, in all gentleness and modesty, to be content with nothing but the highest and the best that thought and conscience can conceive. Oliver is the "last Puritan" because on Puritan grounds (devotion to the best) he is brought to give up Puritanism. With this young earnest aristocrat, Puritanism has lost its absolute certainties and be-

comes an eager, troubled, and ever unsatisfied quest for other alternatives. Shall he accept as his ideal the kindly and gentle Epicureanism of his father, the lively and uninhibited joyous acceptance of life, as it comes, of his handsome and dashing cousin, or the somewhat earthy but hearty naturalness of his friend, the young British naval officer, or perhaps even the unworldly cultivation of the higher life of the spirit of his religious uncle, or his friend, the old English vicar? Though much tempted in turn, his Puritan keenness of sight discovers that these various attitudes are either withdrawals from life or too easy acceptances of it. The Puritan, unlike Santayana, must demand that the best be not simply loved and contemplated but also made real. But what is the best that is to be sought and established with such singleness of purpose? To this the troubled Puritan has no answer, he only knows "he disapproves his own former disapprovals." Puritanism, whether confident or frustrated, represents an austerity which Santayana admires but cannot embrace. For him, as ever, a Platonism without the Laws, a Christianity turned into poetry, the sheer contemplation of the eternal essences of things gives life all the meaning and beauty his soul could ask.

CORNELIUS KRUSÉ.

Wesleyan University.

The Return to Religion. By HENRY C. LINK. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$1.75.

THIS book—a more adequate title for which might be "The Return to Sanity"—will be widely read and quoted in the next months, as it richly deserves to be. How the author, a practicing psychologist, has found the central facts of our Christian faith to be bed-rock, upon

which we must build a sound personal and social life, is its central theme.

The emphasis upon cultivating extra-vert or unselfish habits is continuous. How these may be secured, including the sharp limits of formal education in the process, is well handled.

It is refreshing and useful to be told at this hour: "There is no more reason for the extensive study of psychology by adults than there is for the reading of books on anatomy and medicine. Both habits tend to produce hypochondriacs and are symptoms of over-education, exaggerated habits of absorption."

The chapter on "The Voice of Education" speaks a very timely and urgently needed word. It is well to hear what is almost a lone voice among contemporary educators, speaking a good word for examinations in school and college with grades in figures. Who can fail to see the wholesome truth in the assertion that "the marking system is one of the few definite points at which education resembles the actual world with its systems of incentives and rewards, its mixture of justice and human fallibility"?

The self-styled "liberals," not only of the great denomination referred to, but also those of other church and educational groups, as well as those who are more conservative, might well study on their knees the chapter on "Social Planning" and, indeed, the whole question on how to secure the now highly publicized "abundant life."

The author, while he does not undertake to define adequately the religion to which he himself has returned, gives from the standpoint of the sober psychologist steady and heartening suggestions as to how we may grow in grace.

Unless the reader is in every aspect of his training and experience an entirely different person from the present re-

viewer, he will find this book both provocative and highly instructive, and will probably end by doing as this writer did: buy an extra copy to pass to a friend.

GEORGE IRVING.

National Council of the Y. M. C. A.,
New York City.

Why Do Men Suffer? By LESLIE D. WEATHERHEAD. New York: The Abingdon Press. \$1.25.

IN his newest book, *Why Do Men Suffer?* that younger English Wesleyan preacher has once again made the Christian world his debtor. I am daring to prophesy that thousands of preachers and other thousands of teachers of organized Bible classes will purchase this book. Men may borrow it to read but they will purchase it to keep. The minister will keep it at a handy place on his study table. He will present this book with utmost confidence to those who have been overwhelmed with sorrow and suffering. Heart-ease will grow wherever the book is read.

As in his other works, Mr. Weatherhead writes with modest fearlessness. In his preface is a hint of his thought and spirit. Speaking of those who have suffered much and have won through, he says, "But far better than the theorists, they know that pain and sorrow are caught up into God's heart and carried there; that even agony is both redemptive and redeemed, and the heartbreak of the world becomes music."

In these words it is not difficult to discover a close spiritual relationship between the author and the ever-honored Dr. John Watson, who charmed and cheered another generation with *Beside the Bonnie Briar Bush* and *The Cure of Souls*. Also in this connection the names of Charles Cuthbert Hall and A. J. Gossip come to mind.

In his initial chapter he comes to grips at once with his main problem by flashing on the screen of the mind three fundamental assumptions:

1. That, in spite of heart-rending confusion, quivering agony and sorrow, the universe is intelligible.

2. That God is. When the tortured mind cries, "Is Anybody there?" the answer is an unhesitating and very positive affirmative. That God is infinitely good and infinitely kind.

3. That God is omnipotent, that is, "ultimately, God can achieve His own divine purpose in spite of and even through suffering."

After adducing several illustrations, each one poignant, bearing the stamp of reality, Weatherhead says:

"I believe I could take each one of these cases quoted above and show why it was allowed to happen, and how it fits into the scheme of things, and sketch out a Christian philosophy of the universe that includes them all and explains them. This will be my purpose in the pages that follow."

Critical reading of the following chapters convinces this reviewer that he has come exceedingly close to achieving his purpose.

With poised scholarship, rich in philosophical undergirding, in psychological acuteness, in theological awareness and in amazing human understanding, he discusses such timeless topics as "Why Does God Allow Suffering?" "Why Do the Innocent Suffer?" and "Is Suffering the Will of God?" There is no flinching of the ancient issues involved which are eternally new for each generation. It is Weatherhead's glory that he is a master of lucid, compelling English. Happily he has discarded the dubious crutch of technical language. The wayfaring man will understand and rejoice.

The chapter on "The Weapon of

Faith" is likely to grip the attention of our younger ministry. It is likely to be a self-starter to the engine of idealism. Fouled spark-plugs have seriously affected the engine of God. The concluding chapter, "Is Death a Calamity?" is a bit of honest thinking, concise statement and triumphant conclusion. It is one of the richest chapters in modern religious writing.

Mr. Weatherhead has not loaded down *Why Do Men Suffer?* with long quotations from "eminent authorities," but it is buttressed with adequate documentation. This book for many years will be a working manual for ministers and Christian workers who love God and who desire to be God's harbingers of hope to a pain-conscious world.

TITUS LOWE.

Portland, Oregon.

The Christian Epic. A Study of the New Testament Literature. By MARY ELY LYMAN. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. \$2.50.

THIS book will be heartily welcomed by Bible teachers and ministers wishing a scholarly background for an inspired message. The author possesses both sound learning and the teacher's gift of presentation. Here is the story of the New Testament surveyed chronologically but quite differently from previous treatments. It is a fascinating literary study as well as an historical account. The purpose is to tie the diversified writings together so as to reveal the progress of early Christianity through successive periods, reported through various personalities with unparalleled unity and power. The New Testament is thus treated as a connected epic, and not merely as a collection of books. The reasons for its becoming a world classic are supported from a wide range of

illustrations in comparative literature as well as from the New Testament. Mrs. Lyman understands the characteristics of Greek as well as Hebrew style and the cultural background of the Hellenistic world. In a vivid way, also, she depicts each personality as if alive. She is thoroughly acquainted with the theories as to dates and authorship and so deftly unravels the tangle and so sensibly arrives at a working hypothesis that confusion is avoided and the purpose and power of each writing preserved. Perspective and sense of proportion is evident throughout, while the characteristic colors and artistic touches of the original are revealed. Such a synthetic treatment combined with minute and accurate detail is rare. Surveys easily result in generalities but one feels here that a high-powered lens has been turned on each chapter and verse.

The author's mastery of English enables her to state compactly and clearly in one sentence what many would require a paragraph to express. Because of this compactness of style the book is for teachers, or students under their guidance, rather than for beginners. But anyone at all familiar with modern New-Testament study will find it most helpful. Since Mrs. Lyman's own insight is so keen one sometimes wishes she were not so closely tethered to quotations from other scholars to support her statements, and occasionally one feels a little struggle between the technique of research and the artist's genius. But these are minor criticisms. After the first chapters, especially the stirring presentation of Paul, one wonders if the level will be maintained throughout. But there are no dusty plains; even James and 2 Peter come off triumphant. This is a book in which to rejoice.

LAURA H. WILD.

Mount Holyoke College.

The Psychology of Dealing With People. By WENDELL WHITE.
New York: The Macmillan Company. \$2.50.

"A MAN has certain *fundamental wants*, frequently called instincts, cravings, desires, motives or needs, which constitute the *prime movers* of all his behavior." Therefore, the secret of dealing with people is to understand these native hungers and provide them with wholesome and constructive gratification. Following that thesis, Professor White proposes to write a series of books, one on each of the primal urges, sex, livelihood, variety, etc., showing how each may be utilized in shaping human conduct. This initial volume of the group is concerned with appealing to the want for a feeling of personal worth. It is intended as an elementary introduction to applied psychology and consequently will be of little interest to those who possess even rudimentary knowledge of that field. But the reader who is making his first acquaintance with the subject will be grateful for the masterly fashion in which the author has translated the jargon of the professional into terse, idiomatic, readable English, and will find the treatise a trustworthy guidebook, as far as it goes.

The first half of the volume is devoted to tactful and inoffensive methods of persuading normal individuals to change their ideas and their conduct. This section develops that problem in considerable detail, is provided with a veritable wealth of illustration and concrete suggestion, and should be of great practical value, especially to those whose occupations compel them to deal continually with other people. The second half, which treats our old friend "the inferiority complex," is less satisfactory. The description of the various manifes-

tations of this mental defect is rather superficial, and the suggestions for meeting them are all practically identical, that is, a brief statement that the offending individual should be made to understand why he is misbehaving and then given an opportunity to achieve the sense of personal worth in a legitimate fashion. But there are almost no illustrations nor definite directions for attaining that desirable end.

One also wonders whether the proposal to treat each instinct in a book by itself is the most effective method of teaching applied psychology. The various basic hungers are all so intimately inter-related that it is seldom possible to deal with them one at a time, or to assign any given aspect of behavior to a single elemental impulse. The author recognizes this difficulty in his introduction, but does little to meet it in his text. A treatise in which the various motives were considered in their bearing on each other, and on conduct as a whole, would probably provide the reader with a better technique for dealing with people.

WARREN WHEELER PICKETT.

The First Congregational Church,
Detroit, Michigan.

Guide to Philosophy. By C. E. M. JOAD. London: Victor Gollancz. \$1.50.

IN this potent and illuminating book Professor Joad, who is exercising a healthy and ever-increasing influence in the thought life of English-speaking peoples, provides a keen and lucid analysis of the main themes which have pre-occupied philosophers from Heraclitus to Whitehead for over nearly twenty-five centuries. It is the author's purpose to carry the messages of outstanding philosophers—"the sort of problems which philosophers discuss and the reason why

they discuss them"—to those who have had no exact training in the range, terminology or methods of philosophy. To this end, though philosophy is never an easy subject, he is unusually successful. He draws constant attention to the relevancy and applicability of philosophical theories and insights to the problems and perplexities of ordinarily educated man. It is questionable whether anyone can be taught philosophy. There must be some native capacity and interest; but it is at least possible and wise to become familiar with the sort of questions philosophers have been asking through the ages, the sort of answers they have made, and the reasons each has given for working out the problems differently.

To say that the *Guide to Philosophy* is meant to be understandable to the philosophically uninitiated is not to imply that it is of no considerable value to those who have enjoyed a university course in philosophy or who have spent years in the study of philosophy. The fact is that Joad has succeeded in exposition where Bertrand Russell has failed. He possesses and exercises a remarkable pedagogic aptitude and delights in explaining things to people of limited training.

Professor Joad has sought, and in a high degree managed, to subordinate his personal prejudices and opinions to the needs of unbiased exposition. The fact remains that he does not love the pragmatists, that he distrusts Kantian methods and is the open foe of materialism and mechanism. "If men's wills are not free, praise is as irrelevant as blame is impertinent, and *tout comprendre est tout pardonner* is the beginning and end of ethics." His exposition of the philosophy of Bergson and Whitehead is unusually fine and a delight to any student. "If materialism be true in all that it asserts, philosophy must be abandoned." But Professor Joad gives

us every reason to believe that materialism is not true in all that it asserts. He is, in fact, a prophet as well as a philosopher; his work is creative as well as informative, and one lays down this book with the conviction that vision and values are quite as real as atoms and electrons.

HOBART D. MCKEEHAN.

The Abbey Church,
Huntingdon, Pennsylvania.

The Renewing Gospel. By WALTER RUSSELL BOWIE. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. \$2.

"THERE is yet time for the vindication of what the fashion of our age derides—the LIBERAL Gospel." And here is liberalism at its best, a liberalism for which no apology need be made. It has passion, direction and content. It believes that there is "a conception of the gospel which can make the Christian message come with transfiguring light and transforming power to human souls, and to a whole society."

Our author is modest—he does not profess to blaze a way, but rather to point out existing trail marks.

He is scholarly; but not in a pedantic sense. He knows his contemporary world and the philosophy of the Ancient Faith.

He is prophetic in his touch and has the fire of conviction. Yes: the book has passion.

And it has a poetic strain. Both the kind of poetry that, though written in prose, sounds like music, and "the poetic" in the sense of Aristotle—carrying creative thought.

He has a gift of forceful phrase-making that approaches epigram.

Under the same auspices Phillips Brooks gave his famous definition—"preaching is personality." Bowie believes that, teaches that, is that. The preacher is "no sedulous ape to someone

else." "He is himself." "He brings such a message as he himself is discovering."

The Christian message must face facts; then alone can it become aware of the greater Fact. Relentlessly we are shown the modern scene with its pessimism, cynicism and doubt. But not for long. Our author moves on with an "authority not of dogmatism, but of discovery," not "finality but fertility," that "illuminates both the near and the far."

Jesus is center and substance of any renewing gospel. Creeds "reveal the ways in which men tried to account for the immensity they felt in Jesus." Creeds, however, exaggerate the form of words above the living faith. "One thing is unmistakable," Jesus, "believed Himself to be in the hands of an eternal power and an eternal love." "Overshadowing all the foreground of every day's contingencies was the background of the certainty of God."

It is *the* business of men in the ministry to communicate to others this truth, "that God alone matters." The God of Jesus is trustworthy.

The Christian gospel has hope in it, therefore the history of man is something more than anthropology, "it is more than a tracing of what he has been; it is a disclosure of what he is in process of coming to be."

Bowie sidesteps no problem that his logic or his observation raises—the fatalistic idea of nature, the depreciation of human personality, material estimates of success, Christian ideals confronting a recalcitrant world, progress, and a score of other questions are raised—and answers are suggested if not fully propounded.

There are no end of quotable passages, a score of apt illustrations, and pertinent quotations very many. A good workman needing not to be ashamed, he has rightly divided the word of truth in

these notable and usable lectures—a worthy volume in a great series.

FRANK H. NELSON.

Christ Church,
Cincinnati, Ohio.

The Testimony of the Soul. By RUFUS JONES. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$2.

IN a critical analysis of the philosophy of Peter Wust, Mr. E. I. Watkin (*Essays in Order*, 1931) lays stress upon what he calls "the second naïvety" as being the goal of that process by which harmony is restored between the sensual and spiritual aspects of man's nature and his conscious ego; a process "in which the harmony between the three factors is restored by the conscious affirmation by the active self of the spirit-nature, the love uniting man with Reality and so with God and the conscious correspondence between his expression and his nature, now thus informed by his personality." "To this second naïvety," Mr. Watkin continues, "the naïvety of the perfectly wise man, who is therefore a saint, corresponds a piety which is the conscious reasonable counterpart of the instinctive natural piety of the child and the childlike primitive."

This is a strikingly good description of the philosophical character of Rufus Jones's writing, and (if one may venture to say so) of Rufus Jones himself. He has achieved this "second naïvety"; and in this most recent of his books he gives it mature expression. He is, *par excellence*, a protagonist of what may be described as an *indigenous* mysticism: a mysticism that, to use his own definitive term, is essentially "organic."

One is conscious at all times, as he follows through one of Rufus Jones's chapters, of a kind of ruddy, substantial, vigorous common sense—which runs out

ever so often into genial if ironical humor: as, for example (p. 28), when he concludes a paragraph of warning against a too ardent expectation of spiritual "guidance" by remarking: "I am cautious about expecting secret messages from sociable angels." Or when he reminds us of the way in which Huck Finn knew that he had a conscience; or when he tells us about the old Maine farmer who suffered a stroke and said, "They tell me that I have lost my mind, but I don't miss it any!"

Throughout this book, as throughout all of his writing, Rufus Jones gives away his philosophical and theological assumptions; which, of course, is as it should be. At times, accordingly, one feels justified in quoting Rufus Jones to Rufus Jones, as when he writes: "Here, I am convinced, a metaphysical theory is voicing itself, not an experience. Mysticism has taken this form because it is dominated by a metaphysical theory. My contention has always been that *this particular way* of approach was determined by a prevailing type of philosophical outlook, and is in no real sense essential to genuine mystical experience." That this should be so is inevitable. The mystic who claims Plato and Plotinus as two of his "supreme intellectual guides," and who so frequently calls upon the transcendental idealist Emerson, must necessarily translate the soul's true testimony into terms substantially Platonic.

One should go on, however—still quoting Jones to Jones—and declare that: "The *essentia* of mysticism ought to be thought of simply as the experience of direct communion of the soul with God." Here, to be sure, is the nub of the matter. The essence underlies the substance and is neither altered nor vitiated by the accidental aspects of individual temperament or theory. Rufus Jones stands in the succession of those

whom he calls the "pillar" mystics: and when he tells us that he is "eager to have the word mysticism widened out in meaning to include this milder and more normal correspondence of the soul with God," we know that in the widening there will be no sacrifice of depth. Rufus Jones was born in Maine, and he has entered the kingdom of God. We are glad that his naturalization in the spiritual Kingdom has not kept him from remaining in all human respects a typical State-of-Maine Yankee.

DWIGHT BRADLEY.

Andover Newton Theological School.

Challenge and Power. By WADE CRAWFORD BARCLAY. New York: Abingdon Press. \$1.

THE cult of anthologies has failed to inspire much response in the heart of one countryman, and the present reviewer would usually prescribe: "Anthologies—for others." This is largely because any such collection of material, religious or otherwise, must needs be largely a question of personal taste. Hence, in a world of panel discussions, where men seem anxious to graduate as first-class, senior wranglers, the prospect of making a bouquet acceptable to ragged individualism is not encouraging.

Yet the compiler of this little book is ministering to a universal instinct. Worship is, at least, one of the things men live by, and there are signs, after a time of unparalleled disillusionment, that we are weary of fussing, Martha-like, over the needs of the natural man. A blasé and sophisticated generation has ceased to associate its crowing with the rising of the sun, and may be more ready than we are aware to receive instruction in the technique of worth-ship.

Certainly, Doctor Barclay has assembled for this purpose a multitude that no

man can classify. In a day of odds and no ends, here is a marvelous thing! A Catholic is found, cheek to jowl, with a Quaker, breathing out beatitudes; and a nonconformist leader of the British Labor Party walks with a High Anglican. Here the Middle Ages and the Modern Age meet together; Francis of Assisi and Walter Rauschenbusch kiss each other. The twain meet in Kagawa and W. C. Gordon Lang, Tagore and William Morris, and Greek, Socrates, unites with Roman, Marcus Aurelius. Paul, who bids women be silent in churches, is included in an assembly where Mrs. F. D. Roosevelt speaks, together with Jane Addams and Vida Scudder. This fellowship extends to the arts, for Edgar Guest rubs shoulders with Shakespeare, and Whitehead, the mathematician, is found in the glorious company of the poets. Think of Dean Inge hobnobbing with Keir Hardie and Eugene Debs, and of Chinese Gordon bound up in a single bundle of life with Kirby Page! Even the hearts of the fathers are turned toward the children in a collection of prayers for the latter. Verily, we have, in these suggestions for personal, family and group worship, material for an inclusive religion.

Of course, we might expect that even behind closed doors, and on the mount of transfiguration, where these suggestive prayers and meditations are used, there could be no escape possible from an atmosphere in which the air is full of noises about social security, relief, bonus payments and Townsend plans. The "Unmoved Mover" of Aristotle; the static devotions of Dante; the *via negativa* of the mystic and the Nirvana of oblivion are as far removed from this volume as Knight Templars in an Easter church parade today are from their namesakes who, in the thirteenth century, killed Turks for the glory of God.

Perhaps Doctor Barclay's Methodistic geniality is responsible for the changing of the dying words of Bishop Latimer from "Master Ridley" to "Brother Ridley" (p. 137), but the spelling of the Italian patriot's name as "Massini" (p. 133) seems strange. Because readers are asked to aid in the search for authors, we suggest that G. K. Chesterton be credited with the quotation entitled wrongly "The Soul of the World" (p. 27). The name of the poem is "Home at Last." In addition to the American Revised Version, the Moffatt, Goodspeed and Weymouth translations are used, and the number of hymns cited are conveniently given in the various denominational hymnals. We consider this book is a good investment for all who are desirous of raising the standard of worship services.

W. P. LEMON.

First Presbyterian Church, at the
University of Michigan.

Anglicanism. The Thought and Practice of the Church of England, Illustrated from the Religious Literature of the Seventeenth Century. Compiled and Edited by PAUL ELMER MORE and FRANK LESLIE CROSS. New York: Morehouse Publishing Company, Inc. \$5.

NEWMAN prayed for someone to "catalogue, sort, distribute, select, harmonize, and complete" the "vast inheritance" of the Church of England. Our editors assume the burden of this "Prophetic Office." This is indeed an "inventory of . . . treasures."

And a very complete inventory it is. Eight hundred pages containing three hundred sixty quotations and passages (long and short) from the seventeenth-century Fathers, make up the body of the book. This is prefaced by two admirable essays that deserve a separate printing,

and a wider circulation than the size and cost of this book permits. "Anglicanism in the Seventeenth Century," by Felix R. Arnott, furnishes a preface and introduction to the corpus of the volume, while that prince of the Humanists, Paul Elmer More, writes a disarming defense of the "Via Media." "The true thread of continuity the Anglicans held, was broken either by superimposing new and disputable dogmas upon divine revelation after the manner of Rome, or by disallowing due weight in the practical sphere of religion to the wisdom of accumulated human experience after the manner of Geneva."

The century that produced the Authorized Version and saw the Commonwealth, must ever be of interest. For fifteen years of that same century, the English Church was Presbyterian and produced the Westminster Confession! Hence, much of the theology recorded in this book is necessarily polemic. James I, himself a creditable theologian, gives us in Selection 1 a clear statement of seventeenth-century Anglo-Catholicism: the three creeds, "with primary emphasis on the Apostolic"; the First Four General Councils; reverence for the Fathers; belief in the Scriptures; the Apocrypha as of secondary importance; honor to the memory of the Saints, and recognition of "so many as the Scripture doth canonize"; the Blessed Virgin Mary ("I leave her with her Blessed Son, our Saviour and hers, in eternal felicity"); no saintly intercession; no purgatory; no Pope, *but* bishops and archbishops, yes! (James had had enough of Presbyters in Scotland. They hounded him, he says, before he was born.)

Preachers of vast erudition are here with their sermons—excerpts only (Usher, Tillotson, Barrow, et al.)—and literary men, like Isaac Walton, George Herbert, Donne and Vaughan, with Sir

Thomas Browne!—Anglicans all. Mystics they have, like Trehurne, whose *Centuries of Meditations* was discovered only thirty years ago. Liturgists, too, like Lancelot Andrewes and Cosin and Sanderson. A mighty host.

These Anglicans have no great theological name like Luther or Knox. It is their boast (almost)—"Call no man Master upon the earth." Nevertheless Hooker (the "judicious") and Bishop Pearson are no mean contenders for the faith. And there are others (as the Cambridge Platonists), who ably wield the theistic sword. John Bramhall speaks for all Broad Churchmen (p. 186), "Neither do they oblige any man to believe them (the 39 Articles), but only not to contradict them."

"All sorts and conditions of men" are here (along with Bishop Gunning, who wrote that prayer); High and Low, Broad and Narrow, Right and Left, but with fine tolerance and shepherding heart the Anglican Mother embraces them all. This reviewer once asked the then senior bishop of the Anglican Communion, what was—and is—this secret of their Catholicity and loyalty. He answered, "The episcopate."

Some strong chord surely binds, whatever it be. With gestures of reunion on the left hand (if not on the right), Non-conformists will do well to acquaint themselves with this source book.

The chapter, "Caroline Piety," is revealing and rewarding. "Why, then, should I hate such persons whom God loves and who love God . . . because their understandings have not been brought up like mine . . . have not had the same masters . . . or books . . . or are not so wise, or else are wiser?" (Jeremy Taylor, p. 187.)

JESSE HALSEY.

The Seventh Presbyterian Church,
Cincinnati, Ohio.

The Art of Ministering to the Sick.

By RICHARD C. CABOT and RUSSELL L. DICKS. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$3.

HERE is a book written jointly by the eminent doctor, professor and author, Richard C. Cabot, and by Russell L. Dicks, Chaplain at the Massachusetts General Hospital, with a view to helping pastors in the difficult art of ministering to the sick and to the development of a better rapport between pastor and physician. Each writes with the authority of conviction.

In cases of illness, Protestant clergymen are apt to be paralyzed by a sense of impotency. The Catholic priest is summoned to hear confession, grant absolution, or administer extreme unction. The Protestant minister is less frequently sent for, and what can he do when he responds? The doctor, apothecary, occupational therapist, and librarian all have their distinct functions. Too often, the minister feels that he is only "tolerated, not welcomed," by the doctor.

The authors believe the minister has a distinct function in rousing "the great energies, certainties, and faiths of the Christian religion." "The patient should send for his minister when he gets sick, just as he sends for his doctor." It is to answer the question of how a pastor can and should minister to the sick that this book, with its painstaking thoroughness, deep thoughtfulness, spiritual insight and evangelical fervor, is written. No minister can read it without a deep sense of inadequacy and failure, and yet of profound gratitude that he has been called to such a high and holy ministry.

The pastor's main concern should always be "the growth of souls." In the growth of muscles or other body tissue, there is a jagged, irregular surface, out of which new cells sprout and from

which growth ensues. This is called the Growing Edge. The minister's task is to ascertain the Growing Edge, or, in other words, what the patient's character is and what he wants to make of himself; and to know further just what spiritual food a particular patient can assimilate. When one is ill, a good opportunity is afforded to find his Growing Edge. To find and cultivate that edge is the minister's task. Every good pastor carries on a ministry of fellowship to the lonely and of comfort to the distraught, and for guidance he relies upon his desire to be useful, his intuition, experience and personality.

Among the baffling problems the pastor meets are those of pain and evil. Doctor Cabot discusses these problems in relation to sickness, and in the matter of theology and philosophy many sermons would show to poor advantage in comparison. No pastor will indulge in sermonizing or argumentation in the sick room, but the author believes that if the minister has an underpinning of such a faith and philosophy as this chapter presents, he may, little by little, in conversations, prayers, and atmosphere, help the patient to the understanding that God's wonderful order contains pain as a stimulant, challenge, teacher and guide, and cosmic evil as an essential to our growth. Also, as the physician relies upon nature to do most of the work of healing, the minister must rely upon the prodigiously ingenious and powerful force always at work on his side and "learn to trust this force, not to replace, but to reinforce, his best efforts."

Emphasis is given to the keeping of notes on calling. The minister will do well to emulate the physician in writing down every pertinent fact and impression, and all conversation that might be suggestive for future guidance. In so doing he will realize more vividly the

actual needs of the patient as well as his own shortcomings in the content of his conversation and prayer. If he will read these notes over before making the next call, he will find that his visit and his conversation, far from being casual, will be aimed at purposes as definite as those for which the physician strives.

Suggestions for a helpful ministry in the sickroom are: a—When possible, secure the *presence of a third party*, as this prevents a patient from coming to lean too much upon the minister, with all the attendant implications. In any event, there should always be the consciousness of the fact of God's presence; so long as this is true, the patient will catch something of the same awareness, that another is present. b—Cultivate the art of *listening*. Protestant ministers are pre-eminently preachers, hence are not, as a rule, good listeners. Listening is often the best possible ministry in the sickroom. If the patient is unobtrusively encouraged to talk at the proper time, what he says may do him far more good than anything the minister can say. It is the nearest approach Protestantism has to the Confessional. c—Cultivate the art of *quietness*; not mere silence—but a quality of spirit which comes with the awareness of God's presence.

The reviewer, as the Director and Chaplain of the Methodist Episcopal Hospital in Brooklyn, has good reason, both from experience and observation, to know the inadequacy of much sickroom ministry. It is distressing to listen to doctors who are hospitable to the helpfulness of religion, report injurious ministerial attention. This book is a tonic and challenge to a real ministry, in which thoughtlessness and ignorance are inexcusable.

CHESTER C. MARSHALL.
Methodist Episcopal Hospital,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

Present Theological Tendencies. By EDISON EWART AUBREY. New York: Harper and Brothers. \$2.

American Philosophies of Religion. By HENRY NELSON WIEMAN and BERNARD EUGENE MELAND. Chicago: Willett, Clark and Company. \$3.

DANIEL WEBSTER said in substance in a famous exordium that a mariner long lost in storms and fog would do well to take the sun at his earliest opportunity and find out where he was. These three men have done something very much like that in the theologico-philosophical field. They have made between them an admirable and much needed survey of contemporaneous religious thought, or perhaps more accurately, thought with religious implications and bearings, classified their fellow craftsmen, evaluated them objectively and constructively, and sought some conclusions as to the general direction of the movement of religious thought. Aubrey writes as a theologian, Wieman and Meland as philosophers, but they move in the same general regions.

Both books are admirably organized though Aubrey's organization is the more simple. Theology, he holds, is caught in the weakness of contemporary culture which lacks direction, motivation and morale. Christianity should be relevant to this situation but mostly misses the mark. It is the task of Christian theology to render a new service to culture. How is it meeting its responsibility? Under four forms: Modernism, the Dialectical Theology, Neo-Thomism, Naturalism vs. Supernaturalism. Modernism, he holds, is an attitude rather than a creed. It studies facts and forces, tries to see them steadily and whole. Its approach is first historical and then constructive. It is open-minded, holds no position rigidly, respects science. Its

"left" is humanistic—humanity-centered, not God-centered. Modernism is the projection of earlier Liberalism upon the contemporaneous scene and shares the current reaction against Liberalism and the scientific method. Aubrey analyzes the causes of the revolt against it acutely.

The Dialectical Theology is a revolt; a revolt against Hegel, self-reliance, social Christianity, rational religion and subjectivism and Pippa's little song—(reviewer's addendum). Aubrey sketches the backgrounds of the Barthian movement and his examination of it is detached, inclusive, well documented and as lucid as anything can be made which is, possibly, among many other things a revolt against lucidity. Neo-Thomism is a revival—not a revolt. It offers the discipline of scholastic thought at its best as a cure for the lack of direction, disunity and shallowness of modern society, opposes Aristotle to Plato, seeks an intelligent basis for faith, and offers generally a rationalized support for inherited religion—under the sovereignty of the creeds.

The chapter on "Naturalism vs. Supernaturalism" traces the reaction against science and contrasts the effort of related groups who still work from a naturalistic basis to find in it a ground for theism or some equivalent thereof with the supernaturalism which either stands pat or seeks a God who transcends nature. Aubrey concludes with a summary of the outstanding trends today. He has done a hard thing with balance, insight and a deft digesting of extensive and demanding material.

Wieman and Meland are far more—as the French say—precise. There are over three hundred names in their index of proper names, six double-column, fine-print pages of subject index, six equally fine-print pages of bibliography and from fifteen to thirty citations for

each chapter. Even the reasonably well informed are introduced to philosophers of religion of whom they had not before heard. And the authors are always masters of their material. Theology, they think, is in a bad way unless it be supported by philosophy. Indeed, the theologian, they hold, will for the time being have to give way to the philosopher. One of the few light touches in the book distinguishes between theology and the philosophy of religion. The theologian is a cook, he makes religion digestible. "The theologian talks about beefsteak and lettuce" (spinach not cited), "the philosopher talks about vitamins and proteins." The religious anemia of the modern man is due (possibly) to the fact that he has changed his diet without the advice of a dietitian. The analogy is not wholly happy. Theology has not always been beefsteak and lettuce, nor philosophy rich in vitamins. But one must not be too critical of a philosopher's less serious detours.

Our time is analyzed—acutely; the traditions shaping American religious thought and the present issue of these traditions in action and reaction are the substance of the book. The four traditions are: Supernaturalism, Idealism, Romanticism and Naturalism. "Traditional Supernaturalists" and "Neo-Supernaturalists" are rooted in the tradition of supernaturalism. "Absolutists," "Modern Mystics" and "Personalists" are rooted in the tradition of idealism. The tradition of romanticism is continued in "Ethical Institutionalists" and "Aesthetic Naturalists." "Evolutionary Theists," "Cosmic Theists," "Religious Humanists" and "Empirical Theists" are rooted in the traditions of naturalism. A symposium on the present outlook in the philosophy of religion ends a massive and scholarly book.

Here, too, is detachment, balanced

evaluation, generous recognition, unflinching grace of spirit. And there are abundant citations. The study of Royce has all the signs of a labor of love. Hocking is given respectful admiration, Rufus Jones warm praise and Bowne a really noble tribute. Karl Barth, not being an American, gets three pages, though the page and a half on the "release" of Barthianism are splendidly done. The section on Santayana is rich in quotation, and no wonder. Santayana does the best writing of all the philosophers. Hartley Burr Alexander as quoted comes next, though like his "impurpled Empedocles" his prose is a little too impurpled. Whitehead is always hard going; the authors have done their best. After Whitehead the "Religious Humanists" are open country. Doctor Meland has done a sound chapter on Ames, Dewey, Shailer Mathews, Gerald Smith and Wieman. Doctor Wieman does the concluding perspectives.

In general the "fond" of both books is the same. Aubrey's classifications are more inclusive, the Wieman and Meland classifications more specific, though the frontiers between some of them are much like the frontier between the Mongolian Soviet and Manchoukuo—open to dispute. Aubrey is perhaps more manageable for general orientation, the others for a full knowledge of the terrain. Any reader will be grateful to the three of them for doing it for him. It was not easy. What they have done has been waiting to be done and it is not the kind of thing anyone can do save on a basis of vast and accurate knowledge. We are likely now to have other books in the same field but it is unlikely that anyone writing further can escape the organic schemes of these books.

Some reflections. Both books, and especially the larger one, are generous in their reference to the younger men

who may now feel they belong to history and contemplate themselves detachedly as Eclectics, Neo-Supernaturalists or Empirical Theists. The classification might be still more simplified and no loss. The authors may not be at fault for not furnishing a more definite résumé of trends—one cannot see clearly enough now or far enough ahead, but they might have tried a little harder. It will require a deal of stepping down to make the more distant philosophers preachable. "Infinite," "unfathomable," "absolute," "transcendent" lend atmosphere to philosophy, but one may respectfully enquire what they mean. Most of the philosophers do not seem to make much use of the history of religion. And a sentence of Santayana's is still to be reckoned with: "The great difference between religion and metaphysics is that religion looks for God at the top of life and metaphysics at the bottom, a fact which explains why metaphysics has such difficulty in finding God while religion has never lost Him."

GAUIS GLENN ATKINS.

Auburn Theological Seminary.

Randall Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury. By The Right Reverend G. K. A. BELL, Bishop of Chichester. London and New York: Oxford University Press. Two volumes. \$12.

BISHOP BELL has given the Church Universal an admirable biography of a great ecclesiastical statesman who was in a very real sense his father in God, and in discharging this debt of filial piety the author has also rendered a distinctive public service. Randall Cantaur, to give Lord Davidson his official name as Archbishop, was born in 1848, early enough to remember the funeral of the Duke of Wellington; and he lived until 1930,

having been a bishop for thirty-seven years and for twenty-five Primate of all England. None of his predecessors on the throne of St. Augustine held a more significant chief pastorate or discharged its onerous duties in a more eventful period.

As Canon F. R. Barry observes, "for not less than half a century Randall Davidson . . . was at the very center of great affairs: in constant touch with the Sovereign and Ministers and the chief personages in Church and State, behind the scenes in every important crisis." His influence, which was unimpaired by emotional judgments, reminds one of the sway some medieval ecclesiastics enjoyed as famous servants of the State.

Biography and history blend in the unique position the Archbishop occupied. It would have been impossible to separate his life as a personality of consequence from the major happenings in which he played a leading part. In so doing he presented an extraordinary combination of characteristics seldom found even in serviceable and persuasive men. It is also necessary to remember that unlike many such he had the satisfaction of carrying out his own ideas. His outstanding qualities fitted him to deal with the problems peculiar to his time, and also those of a more permanent nature. He governed with equanimity and without vehemence, and what he said was effective because it was neither loud nor labored. The manifold contradictions he encountered enlarged his capacity for handling with discretion the somewhat passionate forces to which he invariably applied the cooling processes of his benign reasonableness.

He was keenly interested in diplomatic and political affairs and relished his frequent contacts with them. His dictated memoranda and the huge correspondence these and other matters in-

volved have been selected with excellent tact by Doctor Bell. The result is that fresh and revealing light is cast on prominent people and notable policies by the Davidson papers. But the higher value of these handsome volumes is due to the fact that they are an attractive record of a truly wise and noble Christian gentleman, "strong without rage, without o'erflowing, full." He drew opposing interests to himself in his maturity, and reconciled them with sureness of touch and mastery. The World War manifested his sagacity and resourcefulness, and during its long-drawn agonies he found his way to the nation's heart. As another reviewer remarks, "he became the spokesman of the national conscience and the object of such trust and affection as the English people, so stubbornly anticlerical, are not wont to bestow on archbishops." I had the honor of knowing the Archbishop in his last phase, and I revered him for his personal qualities and as the most commanding figure of the Anglican Communion throughout the world. He was cautious to the limit, and refused to carry the banner of any ecclesiastical or political party. But when he chose to lead, as he did in the General Strike, he demonstrated the rarest form of courage which is unafraid of anything; even of being called a coward. In brief, he was *The Model Moderator* who helped heated disputants to find a common mind and to take concerted action.

Every churchman should study this impressive delineation of the Archbishop, not only as a providential administrator in a vexed and turbulent age, but as a quiet unclerical, humble and devout individual whose hidden life was one of unfaltering trust in God and profound consecration to the service of his Lord.

S. PARKES CADMAN.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

The Church and Its Teaching Today.

By WILLIAM TEMPLE, Archbishop of York. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$1.

THIS book comprises the William Belden Noble lectures given by Archbishop Temple at Harvard University in December, 1935. It is divided into two parts: "The Nature and Task of the Christian Church" and "Christian Theology and Modern Thought." Each lecture is an outline treatment of its theme. Compensation for the brevity is found in the unity of the idea set forth and the clarity with which it is presented.

According to Doctor Temple, the Church exists, first and foremost, to be the fellowship of those who worship God in Christ. Jesus did not found a new Church but redeemed a Church already in existence, the assembly of the people of Israel with whom God had made a covenant which was a moral relationship. The people as a whole had shown themselves incapable of responding to the claims of a righteous God, consequently His purpose for Israel must find fulfillment in a faithful few: the doctrine of the Remnant. But when the disciples forsook the Messiah and fled, and He went out alone bearing His cross, the whole destiny of the Church of the Old Covenant, the assembly of the people of Israel, was concentrated in Him, found its fulfillment in Him, and then, reconstituted in Him, started upon its new career. "Freed now from national limitations, the entry into it is no longer either by birth into a particular nation or by naturalization as a citizen of it, but by incorporation into the Body of the Messiah."

What is the task of this new Israel, the reconstituted Church, into which Gentiles, cut out of the wild olive tree, were grafted?

Primarily to *be* itself, Doctor Temple argues, and not to *do* anything at all. Its duty is to *be* in living actuality the redeemed community which worships as redeemed. But what worship means is the submission of the whole being to the object of worship. "It is the opening of the heart to receive the love of God; it is the subjection of conscience to be directed by Him; it is the declaration of need to be fulfilled by Him; and, as the result of all these together, it is the surrender of will to be used by Him. It is the total giving of self."

The worship that we offer is worship of the God of love, and the divine power that comes upon us in worship is the power of love. This must express itself toward others; and so the Church, when it is true to itself, becomes the agency through which the love of God is active in works of mercy and service. In this sense it is the Body of Christ, the organ of His love working in the world "to draw the whole of mankind into the fellowship of love which the Church itself exists to be."

In treating the subject of Christian Theology and Modern Thought the author finds that modern thought is in a state of chaos. There are any number of sharply differing philosophies presented for our acceptance, but there are certain marks about them which appear in almost all instances and which are qualities of temper rather than schemes of thought.

The first is defined as an insistence upon verification in experience of all which is commended for acceptance. Our age is determined to sift and to experiment, to demand that what is presented as truth, especially in the spiritual sphere, shall be verifiable by the tests of actual experience. Theology may learn from this. It is a fair demand that the Church should stand the test which is

proposed, "By their fruits ye shall know them."

The second mark of modern thought is defined as a certain form of the doctrine of relativity, a tendency to let the mind dwell forever in comparisons between practices or beliefs which are partly similar and partly different. In the field of religion this appears in the comparative study of religions. In the past there has been too little recognition that there may be truth and perhaps supplementary truth in other religious traditions than our own. The true Light is proclaimed in the Fourth Gospel as the Light which lighteth every man.

Theology always must be changing because it represents a relationship between an unchanging gospel and a changing world. The object of our faith is not the creeds but is the God of whom the creeds speak, and it is the faith of Christendom that in the gospel there is given an unalterable revelation of Him, "not in the form of doctrinal propositions which once and for all have been drawn up for the acceptance of men of every age, but in the form of a Person and a human Life to which all the doctrinal formulations point us."

The fundamental question for our time is accordingly found to be the question of revelation. Is God a static perfection of being or a personal Will active in the history of the world? The latter is the belief of the Bible, which sets before us a God who is, first and foremost, righteous Will, and whose first demand of His servants is that they conform their wills to His purpose, a God who has "acted with the deliberate purpose of making Himself known." The Archbishop of York accepts the biblical belief with all its implications, one of which is that we must "challenge the scientific thinking of the world at its foundation and roundly deny its totally

baseless dogma of uniformity." God is "fully and completely personal, holding the whole universe in His detailed control."

It would be difficult to find a more suggestive introduction to the study of contemporary religious thought than that contained in these illuminating lectures.

HOWARD CHANDLER ROBBINS,
General Theological Seminary.

The Farther Shore. An Anthology of World Opinion on the Immortality of the Soul. Edited by NATHANIEL E. GRIFFIN and LAWRENCE HUNT. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. \$3.

THIS book, as its title indicates, is an anthology of fifty selections taken from the writings of the most representative philosophers, poets, scientists and religious leaders of the world, ranging from the *Song of an Egyptian Minstrel*, in 2160 B. C., to Theodore Roosevelt's *Great Adventure*, in 1918.

The wide variety of the selections is indicated by the inclusion of passages from *The Book of the Dead*, and from Browning, Homer and Schopenhauer, Buddha and Sir Oliver Lodge, Chuang Tzu and Mahomet, The Upanishads and Saint Paul, Plato and Theodore Parker, Job and Ingersoll. The selections, we are told, were made on the basis of "the representative character of the opinion expressed, the importance of the person quoted and the beauty of literary style."

To the question, "What is it like after we die?" the compilers express no opinion, but they inform us that "it may be of interest to the curious and comfort to the sorrowing to note that the overwhelming majority of the authors selected believe that though the body of man dies his soul lives on."

No question in the history of mankind

has been more frequently asked than the one, "If a man die will he live again?" It is perennial and universal. Everyone of intelligence, at some time or other, has been curious about the problem of survival. We cannot let it alone because it will not let us alone. As Martineau pointed out: "We do not believe in immortality because we can prove it, but we try to prove it because we cannot help believing in it." Belief in man's immortality is ultimately bound up with a general view of the universe which emphasizes its spiritual meaning. It is not merely wishful thinking which makes man bury his dead with faces toward the sunrising. It is a conviction of the whole man rising up in protest against the waste of death. There are those who, like Schopenhauer, say that "to desire immortality is to desire the eternal perpetuation of a great mistake." But this religion of hopelessness is at variance with the deep heart of man, who, as Walter Pater affirms, has a vague sense of continuity with which none of us wholly part. It is a scientist, Sir William Osler, who says in this book, "On the question of immortality the only enduring enlightenment is through faith. 'Only believe,' and 'he that believeth'—these are the commandments with comfort; not 'only think,' and 'he that reasoneth,' for these are the commandments of science." A careful reading of the selection given in this book from Osler's lecture "Science and Immortality," will provide stimulating reading. The famous physician wrote: "To keep his mind sweet the modern scientific man should be saturated with the Bible and Plato, with Homer, Shakespeare and Milton; to see life through their eyes may enable him to strike a balance between the rational and the emotional, which is the most serious difficulty of the intellectual life."

In view of the declared purpose of the editors to give the results of an impartial survey of the world's thought on the subject of immortality, having in mind the importance of the person quoted, one is greatly surprised to find such scant reference to the words of Jesus. Surely we ought to have had more than a few verses from the resurrection story from Saint Mark's Gospel and the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus. Mr. Hunt says that "in the New Testament there is a deep and abiding faith in the life everlasting," and he includes Saint Paul's great chapter, First Corinthians 15, but it seems very strange to give fourteen pages to Plato, great though he is, and one to the gospels. Even Theodore Parker receives ten pages. However one may interpret the gospels, something happened through the Resurrection, something so stupendous and vital that it has changed the history of the world; without it, the history of the Church is unintelligible. It seems to me that more attention should have been given to the words of Jesus. But this is a good book to possess. The introduction to the authors whose selections are given, merits the highest praise. The commendation of Doctor Whitehead in the foreword, is abundantly justified, for each introduction is written with rare judgment, wise discrimination, and literary skill.

J. S. LADD THOMAS.

First Methodist Episcopal Church,
Germantown, Pennsylvania.

Christian Faith and Economic Change. By HALFORD E. LUCKOCK. New York: The Abingdon Press. \$2.

THIS book says the things which need most to be said about the economic order from the Christian point of view. It is careful in its statement of fact. It

is wise in its conception of the precise area of the responsibility of the Church. It is courageous in striking at the roots of the problem without fear of the controversial. It is realistic in its estimate of the obstacles in the Church and the world to the development of a more Christian social order. It is from first to last Christian. At the present time when there is so much controversy about how much or how little the Church as a Church should say about economic questions I should be content to point to this book and suggest that it contains the message by which Christians who have a social vision must stand or fall.

Running through the book there is insistence upon the importance of theology. The Christian social message is rooted in the Christian faith about the nature of reality. Only a God-centered religion is true or adequate. Christian faith is faith in an ethical God whose universal love makes nonsense of all class privilege and the claims of narrow nationalism. Christian faith in God is the foundation for any high view of human personality. It gives meaning to the events of our time for in the light of it our catastrophes become judgments of God upon our ways of living. The condition for any real Christian experience of God is repentance, the repentance which sees realistically the nature of our civilization. Doctor Luccock is always in good form when he describes the perversions of a Christianity which is not based upon such repentance. Much of the book is a commentary with illustrations from modern preaching upon this sentence: "A premature satisfaction in a sentimental expression of religion, cut off from its moral implications, is a persistent bane in the message and life of the Church."

Doctor Luccock is clear and persuasive in summing up the reasons for recogniz-

ing an absolute conflict between Christianity and contemporary capitalism. He defines the present form of capitalism as "a system of society in which the main productive and distributive equipment is in the form of privately owned capital and which is operated primarily for the purpose of money making rather than human use." His indictment of capitalism is familiar ground but he is right in emphasizing it because, as he says: "It hasn't even begun to permeate the fringe of consciousness of the mass of church members."

To this reviewer the most significant thing about this book is the way in which the author goes on from his indictment of capitalism to say that he can see no way of implementing a gospel of love except through social ownership and control of the principal means of production. But before he introduces his discussion of social ownership he says: "The argument which follows is not announced as a part of the gospel." He says with great emphasis that "the position taken in this volume is that no economic rearrangement can be considered the goal of Christianity or its necessary expression." That sentence is followed by the equally important one: "But also that Christianity must be ready to accept any economic rearrangement found on the basis of the most realistic analysis possible to promise the securest foundation for justice, brotherhood, and opportunity for humanity." The indictment of capitalism is a part of the message of Christianity because it is a necessary part of any realistic call to repentance. Doctor Luccock is driven by the gospel as he seeks a method of implementing it in our kind of world to advocate a socialistic direction for society. But he recognizes that his conclusion at that point is not a part of the gospel. He suggests that Paul's method was similar. He par-

aphrases Paul in this way: "I have no revelation from the Lord on this point, but here is the line of action which loyalty to his principle seems to demand." Doctor Luccock's argument for social ownership and control of the principal means of production seems to me unanswerable but it is sound to recognize that it belongs to a different level from the rest of the book.

A summary of this book will leave a wrong impression because the significance of the book does not lie so much

in the parts as in the precise balance of the whole. The best that I could ask for Christian preaching is that it might take on that balance. It is not easy to feel that you are driven by the gospel to advocate a form of implementation which you recognize as belonging to a different level than the gospel. Doctor Luccock shows you how to do it. It is hardly necessary to say that a book by Doctor Luccock has a sparkle all its own.

JOHN C. BENNETT.

Auburn Theological Seminary.

Bookish Brevities

"CERTAIN authors," wrote Pascal, "speaking of their works, say, 'My book,' 'My commentary,' 'My history.' They would do better to say, 'Our book,' 'Our commentary,' 'Our history,' because there is usually more of other people's than their own."

Oxford University has conferred an honorary degree upon Miguel de Unamuno, Rector of Salamanca University, one of the oldest seats of learning in Europe. The writings of this distinguished scholar, who has been disciplined by persecution and exile, are not as well known in the United States as they deserve to be.

The sale of books in the Soviet Union continues to be amazing. A book of poetry or fiction usually exceeds fifty thousand copies. The first printing of a technical book may run to ten thousand. Children's books are in great demand. Public libraries abound and are carefully administered.

Karl Barth in his lectures is insisting that all efforts for Church union will be fruitless, unless accompanied by a deeper and fuller understanding of the Word of God and of the life of Christ, without which no unity is possible.

The late King George V is reported to have read works on sociology and economics with a student's care. After reading such a book, it was his custom to invite some well-qualified person to come in for afternoon tea that he might talk over the book with him.

The election of John A. Mackay to the Presidency of Princeton Theological Seminary is a choice of high significance. Doctor Mackay is a first honor man in philosophy of the University of Aberdeen and a Doctor of Letters of the University of San Marcos, Lima. No American Christian of his age has more of promise for sterling Christian scholarship.

During a persistent blizzard last winter a South Dakotan minister and his wife delivered themselves from death by freezing through burning twenty-five books as fuel. Probably no self-disclosure they ever made was as revealing of their personalities as the titles of the books selected from their library. To imagine oneself in a similar situation would be educative.

One who knew Sidney Lanier well, asked what was his most characteristic tenet, quoted—"The great artist never can work in haste, never in malice, never in even the sub-acid, satiric mood of Thackeray: in love, and love only, can great work, work that not only pulls down but builds up, be done. It is love, and love only, that is constructive in art."

C. E. M. Joad, of the Department of Philosophy, Birbeck College, London University, whose *Guide to Philosophy* is reviewed on another page, distinguishes between two sorts of obscure writing. One is the expression of obscurity and the other the obscurity of expression. This latter he brands as bad craftsmanship, but may it not be sometimes due to the laziness or incapacity of the reader?

Dr. William Hiram Foulkes has been leading in the celebration of the founding of the Old First Church of Newark, of which he is the chief minister. The church was organized in 1666. Doctor Foulkes, one of the most popular speakers on religion over the radio, is the author of a forthcoming volume entitled *Homespun—Along Friendly Road*.

The British Weekly describes Leslie D. Weatherhead as belonging to that select company of preachers who can draw a great congregation in any part of the country on any day of the week and at any hour—a company of preachers so select that if they all traveled together by train, a single compartment would accommodate them and leave plenty of room for their luggage.

The simultaneous reading of books of opposite virtues refreshes the mind. Such reading of a book given to extravagant language and another to understatement shows the latter to be more convincing. The violent phrases of the former are arousing and sometimes entertaining, but the second book is like a weathered cliff which is varying impressively and which can endure the assaulting waves.

The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation, by Dr. Wilbert F. Howard, is now in a Second Edition, with revisions. In America the book has never had the reading it well merits. "From almost every page," said Ernest F. Scott, "I learned something new," and C. F. Andrews declares he finds it of more value than any other study in giving him the help he most needs.

Numerous, many-sided, and marked by admiration reaching toward veneration, are the tributes elicited by the re-

tirement of William Adams Brown from his active professorship in Union Seminary. An abiding confidence that the truth and love of God will ultimately prevail, and a constant inclusion within his understanding of an appreciation of those whom others incline to ostracize, are unforgettable qualities of his nature. Doctor Brown can be depended upon to continue to be illuminating and helpful.

Karl Marx, philosopher, economist and revolutionary, was a model of family affection and a devoted lover of poetry. He read Aeschylus in Greek every year and faithfully he read Shakespeare and Goethe aloud to his children. He no more aimed to lift the proletariat into power than he sought to free the creative spirit from all chains of convention. His well-known phrases, such as, "You have nothing to lose but your chains," were fashioned by the prolonged and painstaking effort which gave finish to all his writings.

Henry van Dyke defined literature "as made up of those human writings which translate the inner meanings of nature and life in language of distinction and charm, touched with the personality of the author, into forms of lasting interest."

He held that four elements enter into good work in literature:

"An original impulse—not necessarily a new idea, but a new sense of the value of an idea.

"A first-hand study of the subject and the material.

"A patient, joyful, unsparing labor for the perfection of form.

"A human aim—to cheer, console, purify or ennoble the life of the people. Without this aim literature has never sent an arrow close to the mark."

Vo

Jo
Wi
LuHa
Ed
Cl
Al
WiS. I.
Go
Rel
The
Fur
The
Rec
The
The
The
Was
Let
Chr
Boo
Boo
IndEdito
Busin
Aven
Enter
1879.
Subse
foreig

CIN